· LOWELL LECTURES ·

FROM JERUSALEM TO NICÆA

PHILIP S. MOXOM

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
BR 165
Chap. ..... Copyright No. .....
Shelf ...M93
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

FROM JERUSALEM TO NICÆA

THE CHURCH IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES

Lowell Lectures

FROM JERUSALEM TO NICÆA

THE CHURCH IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES

BY

PHILIP STAFFORD MOXOM

AUTHOR OF "THE AIM OF LIFE"

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT
JUN 7 1895
CITY OF WASHINGTON

11791-aa'

BOSTON
ROBERTS BROTHERS
1895

BR165
.M93

Copyright, 1895,
By Roberts Brothers.

University Press:
John Wilson and Son, Cambridge, U.S.A.

✠

In Sacred Memory

OF TWO FRIENDS

HANNAH BRADBURY GOODWIN

AND

NATHANAEL SCHNEIDER, M.D.

✠

PREFACE.

THESE Lectures were delivered under the auspices of the Lowell Institute, in Boston, on the successive Tuesday and Friday evenings from February 12th to March 8th, 1895. They are printed as they were delivered, save that much matter, consisting mainly of illustrative quotations from the early Fathers, which had to be omitted in the delivery, appears in these pages. It scarcely needs to be said that scholars will find in the lectures nothing new; but I dare to believe that the general reader will find here, in intelligible form, much which he shall look for elsewhere in vain, save in more or less voluminous and sometimes not easily obtainable church histories.

My thanks are due to the friends by whom I was inspired to undertake this task; and I am specially indebted to the Rev. David Nelson Beach

who has aided me by his enthusiastic interest in my work, and by valuable suggestions, and also to Professor William Mathews, LL. D., who has rendered my readers as well as myself a great service by preparing the index which concludes this volume.

PHILIP STAFFORD MOXOM.

SPRINGFIELD, Mass.,
March, 1895.

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Rise and Spread of Christianity	13
The Organization of the Early Church	52
The Apostolic Fathers	99
The Struggle with Heathenism: The Persecutions	163
The Struggle with Heathenism: The Apologists	218
The Struggle within the Church: Heresies	276
The Christian School of Alexandria	333
The First Ecumenical Council	393
Appendix	445
Index	447

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.

THE following is a list of most of the works which have been read or consulted in the preparation of these lectures. It is given specially for the convenience of readers who wish to investigate for themselves the subject here presented.

"The Encyclopædia Britannica," 9th edition, especially the articles by Harnack; Hackett's Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible;" Smith and Cheetham's "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities;" Smith and Wace's "Dictionary of Christian Biography;" McClintock and Strong's "Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature;" The Schaff-Herzog "Cyclopædia;" "A Catholic Dictionary," by Addis and Arnold; the "Church Histories," by Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Neander, Baur, Kurtz, Giesseler, Guericke, Schaff, Moeller, Cheetham, Fisher, Sheldon, and Pressensé; Eusebius's "Life of Constantine;" Tacitus's "Annals;" Pliny's "Letters;" Strabo's "Geography;" Philo-Judæus's "Works;" Tatian's "Diatessaron; "The Ante-Nicene Fathers," 24 volumes; Ramsay's "The Church in the Roman Empire;" Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," and "Christian Institutions;" Mommsen's "History of Rome;" Gibbon's "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;" Milman's "History of Christianity;" Plummer's "The Church of the Early Fathers;" Farrar's

"Lives of the Fathers," "Life and Work of St. Paul," and "Early Years of Christianity;" Lecky's "History of European Morals;" Fisher's "Beginnings of Christianity;" Lightfoot's "Apostolic Fathers," "Essays," and Commentaries on Galatians and Philippians; Reeve's "Apology of Tertullian;" Bigg's "Christian Platonists of Alexandria;" Ueberweg's "History of Philosophy;" Hatch's "Organization of the Early Church;" A. V. G. Allen's "Continuity of Christian Thought;" "Literature of the Second Century," by Wynne, Bernard, and Hemphill; Uhlhorn's "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism," and "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church;" Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul;" "The Gospel of St. Peter," by Rendel Harris; Cape's "Early Empire," and "Age of the Antonines;" Jenning's "Manual of Church History;" F. H. Hedge's "Ways of the Spirit;" J. H. Allen's "Fragments of Christian History;" Newman's "History of the Arians of the Fourth Century;" Bishop Kaye's "Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries," and "Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria;" Poole's "Life and Times of S. Cyprian," Caldwell's "Cities of Our Faith," and Schaff's "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles."

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF ROMAN EMPERORS FROM AUGUSTUS TO CONSTANTINE.

Augustus	B.C.	31–	A.D.	14
Tiberius	A.D.	14–	"	37
Caligula	"	37–	"	41
Claudius	"	41–	"	54
Nero	"	54–	"	68
Galba	"	68–	"	69
Otho Vitellius			"	69
Vespasian	"	69–	"	79
Titus	"	79–	"	81
Domitian	"	81–	"	96
Nerva	"	96–	"	98
Trajan	"	97–	"	117
Hadrian	"	117–	"	138
Antoninus Pius	"	138–	"	161
Marcus Aurelius	"	161–	"	180
Commodus	"	180–	"	192
Pertinax Didius Julianus			"	193
Septimius Severus	"	193–	"	211
Caracalla	"	211–	"	217
Macrinus	"	217-	"	218
Elagabalus	"	219–	"	222
Alexander Severus	"	222–	"	235
Maximin	"	235–	"	238
Gordian	"	238–	"	244

Philip	B.C. 244–	A.D. 249
Decius	" 249–	" 251
Gallus	" 251–	" 253
Valerian	" 253–	" 260
Gallienus	" 261–	" 268
Claudius II.	" 269–	" 270
Aurelian	" 270–	" 275
Tacitus	" 275–	" 276
Probus	" 276–	" 282
Carus	" 282–	" 283
Diocletian	" 283–	" 305
Maximian	" 286–	
Constantius	" 305–	" 306
Galerius		311
Severus	" 306–	" 307
Maxentius		312
Maximian		310
Maximin Daza	" 307–	" 313
Licinius		323
Constantine		337
Constantine, Sole Emperor	" 323–	" 337

FROM JERUSALEM TO NICÆA.

THE RISE AND SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

MY function in the present course of lectures, as I have conceived it, is not to propound and unfold a theory, but to confine myself mainly to a statement of facts. The first three centuries of the Christian era is a time of beginnings. In that time may be found the germs of all the later developments of Christian institutions and Christian thought. An intelligent acquaintance with the facts of that early time is absolutely necessary to a clear understanding of the later developments. Those facts I shall try to give with such fulness and distinctness as will enable intelligent hearers, who heretofore have had little acquaintance with the story of the early Church, to form some just judgment on the extent and significance of that extraordinary phenomenon in history, — the rise and development of the Christian religion. Much that is interesting, and, from an historical point of

view, valuable, must be omitted; but, I believe, nothing will be omitted that is essential. If in some directions I have gone into rather minute detail as, for example, in the account of Gnosticism, it is because in the treatment of this subject, the ordinary and accessible church histories are usually too compendious to be either interesting or intelligible to the lay reader.

The contemporary story of the beginning of Christianity is confined almost entirely to the various documents which make up the New Testament. The earliest of these documents are the authentic and universally acknowledged epistles of St. Paul. These epistles imply the basis of the essential facts which are given in the Gospels. The story is too familiar to require repetition here, save in a simple outline that may be presented in a few words.

In Palestine, a small and obscure province of the Roman empire, there appeared, during the reign of Tiberius, a Teacher and Prophet named Jesus of Nazareth. For a little more than three years this Teacher and Prophet engaged in the work of announcing His message, inculcating His ideas of God and righteousness, and ministering to the needs of the sick and the poor. He gathered about Him a group of about a dozen men, mostly humble fishermen, whom He instructed in His principles and methods, and whom He bound to Himself by ties of confidence and affection that

proved to be indestructible. The teaching of Jesus, claiming to be a message from God, while it appealed to multitudes of men with a power beyond that of any other religious teaching which has been given to the world, excited the animosity of the ruling classes among the Jews, especially the Pharisees, and brought on a conflict which in a little time issued in His violent death on the cross. His disciples, at first overwhelmed by sorrow and despair, in a short time strongly revived in confidence and courage, and developed a devotion to the name of Jesus and a zeal in His service which made them successful propagators of the new faith and life.

These disciples believed that Jesus had come forth from God to reveal to men the nature and purposes of God, and to bring to the world salvation from sin. They believed that, after three days in the embrace of death, He rose from the dead and lived in personal communication with them for the space of forty days, explaining and confirming the teaching which He had previously given them; and that He finally departed from their sight to be no more the local and visible Christ, but henceforth to be the Divine Administrator of the Kingdom of God in the world.

Inspired with this faith, they became invincibly courageous in proclaiming the message which they had received from Him; and they proved their fidelity to His teaching by untiring labors, by

exalted purity of life, by patient endurance of suffering, and finally by martyrdom.

The story in the book of the Acts of the Apostles reveals that a fresh and mighty impulse had come into human life. The new movement, beginning at Jerusalem, rapidly extended itself in Palestine. Although at first none of those who had been the immediate disciples of Jesus, and were recognized as His apostles, either extended their labors outside of Palestine, or seemed to have the intention of doing so, yet their preaching to the multitude in Jerusalem, which contained representatives of various nations other than the Jewish, kindled a faith and enthusiasm like their own in the hearts of many men who went forth to be missionaries of the gospel of Christ. It was not because of any deliberate purpose at first, then, but because of the inevitable expansive force of the new faith, that it spread beyond the confines of the Holy Land.

The records of the time, meagre as they are, show us that Christianity soon pushed beyond the narrow bounds of Judea, and beyond the immediate influence of the apostles, and created centres of Christian life and thought in distant cities. In a short time the antagonism of the Jewish leaders to the gospel developed into persecutions which scattered the believers in Jesus. These scattered believers everywhere became disseminators of the Christian doctrines. We know, for example, that

Christian churches were founded in Antioch and Rome and other places without the knowledge or presence of the apostles.

At first, the disposition of the apostles, who were all Jews, was to confine the preaching of the gospel to their own countrymen; but in a short time a new worker came upon the scene. This was Saul of Tarsus, who is known in Christian history as St. Paul. This man, a native of Tarsus, a free city of the Roman empire, and himself a free citizen, was bred in the traditions and principles of the Hebrew religion, and was carefully educated in all the Hebrew learning in the school of Rabbi Gamaliel in Jerusalem.

At first, Paul was a vehement persecutor of the followers of Jesus, but a remarkable experience which came to him while he was on the way to Damascus on an errand of persecution, resulted in his entire conversion to the Christian faith. From this time, Paul became an ardent and effective preacher of the Gospel of Jesus. His surviving letters, most of which have been authenticated by the severest criticism of modern scholars, contain, incorporated in his peculiar thought, the substance of the Christian facts and faith, and set forth the Divine Personality of the Founder of Christianity; and these epistles, more than any other part of the New Testament, have shaped the theology of the Christian Church for nearly nineteen centuries.

With the conversion of Paul, thus, not only a

new personality, but also a larger conception of the gospel came into the field. He conceived that the message which Jesus gave was not designed for Jews only, but for humanity. In his teaching and his aim, Christianity became what Jesus evidently designed it should be, the universal faith.

Almost from the beginning of Paul's ministry, therefore, Christianity passed out of the narrow bounds of Judaism, and addressed itself to the conquest of the world. The story of Paul's travels and labors has the fascination of romance. By his efforts the gospel was diffused throughout Asia Minor, Christian churches sprang up under his preaching in nearly every province of that peninsula, and converts to Christ were gathered in Macedonia and Achaia, and possibly, also, in Arabia and Spain.

St. Paul suffered martyrdom near the end of the reign of Nero, about 68 A. D. At the time of his death, less than forty years after the reputed ascension of Jesus, the Christian faith had already taken root in many places throughout a considerable part of the Roman empire. From the Acts of the Apostles and other writings of the first century, it appears that in Antioch, in Pisidia, nearly the whole population came together to listen to Paul. In Ephesus the temple of the tutelary goddess, Diana, was all but deserted; the silversmiths, who did a thriving business in the manufacture of small models of the temple for the use of worshippers,

complained that their business was almost ruined; and the magicians, of whom there was a great number, abandoned their arts and burned their books in the public square. In Jerusalem, Syrian Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome were large churches, in one or two cases certainly numbering their members by thousands. We learn that somewhat later, there were fifty thousand members in the church in Antioch. In Rome there were Christians enough to attract the attention of the emperor and excite the antipathy, if not the apprehension, of the citizens. In Thessalonica it was the popular cry that the apostles had turned the world upside down. So rapid was the spread of Christianity that Paul used pardonable hyperbole when he exclaimed that the gospel was bearing fruit in all the world, and that it had been preached "in the whole creation which is under heaven." Nor were the Christians confined to the poor and wretched. There were women of wealth and distinction in the Church, such as Lydia, in Philippi, the "chief women" of Thessalonica, and Domitilla, a relative of Domitian's, in Rome. Of prominent men who were converts to the Christian faith, we have the names of Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus; Publius, the Roman governor of Malta; Flavius Clemens, a consul; the Asiarchs, or chief officers of Asia, in Ephesus; Dionysius, a member of the Council of Areopagus in Athens; Erastus, the public treasurer in Corinth; Cornelius, the

centurion; Luke, the physician; Theophilus, to whom Luke addressed his writings; Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue in Corinth; and members of the Jewish sanhedrim, the priesthood, and the sect of the Pharisees.

There is a lack of precise and abundant information for about sixty years after the death of Paul. From the first quarter of the second century historical records of the growth of Christianity grow clearer and more abundant. A study of those records up to the close of the third century reveals that Christianity was extended with extraordinary rapidity throughout the known world. There is evidence that soon after the middle of the second century there was a Christian church in Edessa so flourishing as to count among its members Abgar Bar Manu, king of Orshene in Mesopotamia. About the same time there were churches, or groups of believers in the Christian faith, in various parts of Persia, Media, Parthia, and Bactria.

Christian churches in Arabia were visited by Origen in the early part of the third century; and there is fairly good evidence that there was a Christian church in India as early as 350 A. D. In Egypt, Christianity made great progress, especially in Alexandria, which is the traditional scene of the labors of St. Mark. It also penetrated Cyrene and neighboring territories. In Upper Egypt, the gospel found a lodgement, before the

close of the second century, among the Copts, the reputed descendants of the ancient Egyptians.

The gospel extended throughout Proconsular Africa, and developed a powerful centre of life in Carthage. As early as 256 A. D. Cyprian was able to convene in Carthage a synod of eighty-seven bishops, "in the presence of a vast laity," and this was the seventh synod in that city during Cyprian's episcopate. Half a century earlier than this "the Christians in Roman Africa were to be counted by thousands, if not by millions." There is record of a synod held in Carthage shortly after 200 A. D. in which were assembled seventy African and Numidian bishops. North of the Mediterranean, Christianity was extended somewhat less rapidly; but we find that between 175 and 200 A. D., there were strong Christian churches at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons at that time, speaks of the gospel as already established in Germany, at least, west of the Rhine. There are more or less vague traditions of the gospel having quite early reached Britain and Spain. It is not at all impossible that St. Paul himself preached the gospel in Spain. In Britain, Christianity had made such progress that, at the Council of Arles, in 314 A. D., British churches were represented by the bishops of York, London, and Lincoln. By the time of Diocletian there were many Christians in the court and in civic offices, as well as in the army. As early as the time of Septimius Severus

(193–211) they had become so numerous that they might have paralyzed the armies of the empire; under Diocletian they were practically in the majority. The persecution begun by the latter, and carried on more vigorously by Galerius, failed, because the extinction of the Christians meant the extinction of half the empire; and after ten years of determined and bloody endeavor to exterminate Christianity, the empire became Christian at one blow.

Such, in brief, is the account of the rapid extension of the Christian faith during the first three centuries. Important evidence as to the number of the early Christians is furnished by the Catacombs of Rome. These remarkable subterranean chambers, which were designed as receptacles for the Christian dead, served also in times of persecution as places of refuge and even as places of worship. For many centuries the Catacombs were not only hidden from sight, but, apparently, were even forgotten. Late in the sixteenth century, however (1578), some laborers, digging for Pozzolana earth, near Rome, accidentally discovered a sepulchral chamber. This was the beginning of the discovery of the vast subterranean city, which contained records of early Christianity as striking and as abundant as those which the discovery of the ruins of Pompeii, in recent times, have furnished concerning Roman domestic life at the beginning of the Christian era.

I may not take the time now to give any description of the Catacombs. I mention them simply because they furnish noteworthy evidence as to the vast number of believers in Christ which there must have been in Rome previous to A. D. 350. After that date the Catacombs ceased to be much used as a place of burial; far the larger number of interments in them, therefore, must have taken place previous to that date.

Padre Marchi estimates the length of these subterranean burial chambers, at eight or nine hundred miles, which would give them a capacity for between six and seven million bodies. This estimate is undoubtedly extravagant. Michele de Rossi estimates the length at 957,800 yards, or about five hundred and ninety miles. This would give the Catacombs a capacity for nearly or quite four million bodies. Northcote and Brownlow estimate the length at not less than three hundred and fifty miles, which would give space for about three million bodies. It is not likely that this last estimate could be materially reduced, but if it were reduced one-half, the evidence which, even then, the Catacombs furnish of a very large Christian population in the city of Rome during the second and third centuries, is very strong.

I turn now, for a few minutes, to the testimony of contemporary writers. The Roman historian Tacitus, in his account of the burning of Rome

and the persecution of the Christians by Nero in A. D. 64, implies that the number of Christians in the Roman capital, even at that early date, was large. The Christians were charged by Nero with setting fire to the city. Says Tacitus: "First those were seized who confessed they were Christians; next, on their information, a vast multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of burning the city, as of hating the human race." The charge of hating the human race, was, as we shall see, one of the earliest charges brought against the Christians by their enemies. It was due to the fact that, in loyalty to their faith, the Christians withdrew from many of the occupations and social pleasures of their fellow-countrymen, because these were so inextricably involved with idolatry. The testimony of Tacitus, as to the great number of Christians thus early, is not affected in value by his opinion as to their character.

Pliny, governor of Bithynia and Pontus under Trajan, wrote to his imperial master, in 111 A. D., asking for directions as to how he should treat the Christians. His letter makes it clear that already Christians were so numerous in the provinces which he governed that the heathen temples were largely deserted, and the "sacred rites" of the heathen religion had almost ceased. He was perplexed by the immense number of those with whom he must deal as offenders against the Roman law by practising an illicit religion. In his letter he

says: "It appears to be a matter highly deserving your consideration, more especially as great numbers must be involved in the danger of these persecutions, which have already extended, and are still likely to extend, to persons of all ranks and ages and even both sexes. In fact, this contagious superstition is not confined to the city only, but has spread its infection among the neighboring villages and country."

Let us turn now to the testimony of the Christian Apologists. Of these there arose a great number, especially during the second century and the early part of the third, — Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Irenæus, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and others. These bear convincing testimony to the rapid and wide extension of Christianity. They show that before the close of the second century it had grown to be a recognized power in the empire; that before the middle of the third century it had a philosophy as well as a gospel to offer to men; that it boldly laid claim to universal acceptance and obedience; and also that it had made many converts among the rich and learned as well as among the poor and ignorant. I can give but a few examples now, which, however, are sufficient to indicate the character and extent of the testimony. Justin Martyr, who wrote between 135 and 163 A. D., in his "Dialogue with Trypho," makes this statement: "For there is not one

single race of men, whether barbarians or Greeks, or whatever they may be called, nomads, or vagrants, or herdsmen living in tents, among whom prayers and giving of thanks are not offered through the Name of the crucified Jesus."

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, who wrote between 170 and 200 A. D., speaks as follows: "The church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith." Again he says: "Although the languages of the world are dissimilar, yet the import of the tradition is one and the same. For the churches which have been planted in Germany do not believe or hand down anything different, nor do those in Spain, nor those in Gaul, nor those in the East, nor those in Egypt, nor those in Libya, nor those which have been established in the central regions of the world." By the expression "central regions," Irenæus evidently means the churches in Palestine.

Tertullian, a distinguished presbyter of Carthage, writing between 197 and 220 A. D., gives the following testimony in his "Address to Scapula": "One would think it must be abundantly clear to you that the religious system under whose rules we act is one inculcating a divine patience; since, though our numbers are so great, — consisting of *all but the majority in every city*, — we conduct ourselves so quietly and modestly." In his

"Apology" he says: "The outcry is that the state is filled with Christians, — that they are in the fields, in the citadels, in the islands; they make lamentation, as for some calamity, that both sexes, every age and condition, even high rank, are passing over to the profession of the Christian faith." In the same writing he declares: "We are but of yesterday, and we have filled every place among you — cities, islands, fortresses, towns, marketplaces, the very camp, tribes, companies, palaces, senate, forum, — we have left nothing to you but the temples of your gods. For what wars should we not be fit, not eager, even with unequal forces, we who so willingly yield ourselves to the sword, if in our religion it were not counted better to be slain than to slay? Without arms even, and raising no insurrectionary banner, but simply in enmity to you, we could carry on the contest with you by an ill-willed severance alone. For if such multitudes of men were to break away from you, and betake themselves to some remote corner of the world, why, the very loss of so many citizens, whatever sort they were, would cover the empire with shame; nay, in the very forsaking, vengeance would be inflicted. Why, you would be horror-struck at the solitude in which you would find yourselves, at such an all-prevailing silence, and that stupor as of a dead world. You would have to seek subjects to govern. You would have more ene-

mies than citizens remaining. For now it is the immense number of Christians which makes your enemies so few, — almost all the inhabitants of your various cities being followers of Christ."

In his work called "To the Nations," which Tertullian addressed to the general public, while his "Apology" he had addressed rather to the rulers and magistrates of the empire, he exclaims: "Your constant cry is that the state is beset [by us]; that Christians are in your fields, in your camps, in your islands. You grieve over it as a calamity that each sex, every age — in short, every rank — is passing over from you to us."

In his "Answer to the Jews," the same writer says: "Upon whom else have the universal nations believed but the Christ who has already come? For whom have the nations believed, — Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and they who inhabit Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, and they who dwell in Pontus, and Asia, and Pamphylia, tarriers in Egypt, and inhabiters of the region of Africa which is beyond Cyrene, Romans and sojourners, yes, and in Jerusalem, Jews, and all other nations; as for instance, by this time, the varied races of the Gætulians, and manifold confines of the Moors, all the limits of the Spains, and the diverse nations of the Gauls, and the haunts of the Britons (inaccessible to the Romans, but subjugated to Christ), and of the Sarmatians, and Dacians, and Germans, and

Scythians, and of many remote nations, and of provinces and islands many, to us unknown, and which we can scarce enumerate? In all of which places the name of the Christ who is already come reigns as of Him before Whom the gates of all cities have been opened. . . .

"But Christ's name is being extended everywhere, believed everywhere, worshipped everywhere by all the above enumerated nations."

The "Apology" was written in A. D. 197, and the "Address to the Nations" soon after; the "Address to Scapula" and the "Answer to the Jews" about 211. Some abatement from this testimony may be allowed on account of Tertullian's well-known rhetorical style, but after all reasonable abatement has been made, there remains an abundant and uncontradicted testimony from Tertullian to the wide extension of Christianity before the end of the second century. Tertullian's testimony is strengthened by the consideration that he boldly challenged criticism by numerous explicit statements made repeatedly in published works, through the space of from sixteen to twenty years; that his writings compelled the attention of pagan officials and philosophers who would not be slow to detect and contradict misstatements; and that his very rhetorical instinct would lead him to base his eloquence on facts so well-known as to be almost commonplace until he gave them fresh significance by his fervent style.

Clement of Alexandria, who wrote between 189 and 200 A. D., contrasting the gospel with philosophy, says: "The philosophers chose to teach philosophy to the Greeks alone, and not even to all of them; . . . but the word of our Teacher remained not in Judea alone, as philosophy did in Greece; but was diffused over the whole world, over every nation, and village, and town, bringing already over to the truth, whole houses, and each individual of those who heard it by himself, and not a few of the philosophers themselves."

Origen, who wrote between A. D. 220 and 250, in his writing, "Against Celsus," the most important apologetic work produced by the early Church, uses the following language: "At the present day, indeed, when, owing to the multitude of Christian believers, not only rich men, but persons of rank, and delicate and high-born ladies, receive the teachers of Christianity, some perhaps will dare to say that it is for the sake of a little glory that certain individuals assume the office of Christian instructors."

In another place he quotes from Celsus the following: "Christians at first were few in number, and held the same opinions; but when they grew to be *a great multitude* they were divided and separated, each wishing to have his own individual party, — for this was their object from the beginning." Here we have the involuntary testimony of a bitter opponent of Christianity, who wrote as early as 177 or 178 A. D.

To this remark Origen replies: "That Christians at first were few in number, *in comparison with the multitudes which subsequently became Christian*, is undoubted," etc. In these words Origen confirms the testimony of Celsus and adds his own.

But apart from the detailed evidence which I have thus rapidly summarized, the certain fact arises before us that Christianity, beginning about the year 30 A. D. in a single person, a Jew, who was crucified by the Romans at the instigation of His fellow-countrymen, and who had a following of only a few humble disciples, in less than three hundred years took possession of the Roman empire, and seated itself permanently upon the imperial throne. In a period slightly less than that which separates the present time from the death of Shakespeare, the new religion, against the entire force of heathenism, overcame all obstacles, overturned the deep-rooted polytheisms of Greece, Rome, Asia, and Gaul, and changed the character and course of civilization. The history of the world presents no phenomenon so striking, no movement of the human race so vast in extent and so significant in its results.

The explanation of this phenomenon constitutes the largest and most interesting problem that confronts the philosophic student of history. Christianity is a complex fact, not only of the past, but also of the present. Beginning more than eighteen centuries ago, the religion of Jesus is to-day

immeasurably the greatest spiritual force in the world. It is co-extensive with the peoples that have achieved the largest progress in the arts and industries, and have attained the highest civilization; it is professed by all the nations of Europe, has been widely diffused in Asia and Africa, and possesses and rules the great nations which occupy the Western Hemisphere, — a territory unknown to the world until long after the Roman empire had fallen into ruin. It is difficult for us to approach this question with entirely impartial minds. We have been born and nurtured in the atmosphere of Christianity. Our ethics and our ideals, individual and social, have been inspired and shaped by the teachings of Jesus. It is, however, true, that an adherence to the essential principles of Christianity is not necessarily a disqualification for forming a dispassionate and sound judgment on the problem before us. It might be argued, indeed, that only one who has an interior knowledge of the Christian faith is able to form any adequate idea of its nature, and to reach any just conclusions as to its source and the reasons of its extraordinary development.

Let us consider, first, some of the conditions in the midst of which Christianity took its rise. Politically the world had attained to a degree of unity previously unknown. Under the lead of Julius Cæsar and of Augustus, the Roman arms had extended the power of the empire to the remotest

confines of civilization, exclusive of China and India, and even over large territories of barbarous and savage races. The Mediterranean had become a Roman lake. The dominion of the emperor extended from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, from the wild moors of Scotland to the deserts of Africa, and contained a population of probably not less than one hundred million souls.

Throughout this immense domain the Roman power was sufficiently strong to make itself felt as a unifying force upon the civil life of innumerable and diverse peoples. Under Augustus, a process of centralization was carried on, which gave a practically uniform administration of law over the whole empire. As some one has said: "The Romans conquered like savages, but ruled like philosophic statesmen, till, from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, from the shores of Britain and the borders of the German forests to the sands of the African deserts, the whole Western world was consolidated into one great commonwealth, united by bonds of law and government, and by the facilities of communication and commerce, and by the general dissemination of the Greek and Latin languages."

In the time of Tiberius, in the latter part of whose reign Christianity arose, a universal peace prevailed, and already a common political life pervaded the empire. The privileges and immunities of citizenship, which at first were jealously confined

to Rome, were soon extended to individuals and to cities beyond the boundaries of Italy; and this extension went on so rapidly that it was made practically universal by Caracalla between 211 and 217 A. D.

The maintenance and administration of the vast empire which Roman arms had conquered, required the planting of military colonies in many remote provinces of the territory, and the building of roads and the development of means for easy and rapid communication. The nature and extent of the means for communication Uhlhorn thus graphically describes: "The first emperor, Augustus, erected in the Forum at Rome a golden milestone. It stood as a symbol that there was the centre of the world. A network of artificial highways, even then nearly completed, extended from this point through the entire empire. From Cadiz in Spain, through France, through Italy, away up to the cataracts of the Nile, from the lands of the Danube even to the Pillars of Hercules, the traveller could journey over well-built roads, and find everywhere, at certain distances, *mutationes* for change of horses, and *mansiones* for lodging at night. These roads were so many cords binding the conquered world to the centre, Rome, — so many channels for the impulses which streamed forth from it. On these roads marched the legions to keep under control the subjugated world, and to protect the boundaries; on these roads proconsuls

and prætors went into the provinces to administer law and justice, and swift couriers bore the edicts of the emperor to the extreme circumference of the broad empire; over these highways commerce moved, and Romans of distinction journeyed to gain knowledge of the world; over these highways, too, went the messengers of the gospel, bearing from city to city the joyful tidings of a manifested Redeemer."

The barriers between the nations were thus broken down, and a thitherto unknown freedom of intercourse prevailed among the diverse peoples of the East and West. The result of all this was an increasing homogeneousness of thought, and of social as well as political life. The Greek tongue, the language of letters and commerce, was almost universally known; and the Latin tongue, the language of law and civil administration, had a nearly equal extension. The political unification of the empire stimulated international commerce and a cosmopolitan education. The world was thus singularly prepared for the diffusion of the Christian faith.

There were also moral conditions of great importance. The religions of the ancient world were almost entirely polytheistic and ethnic. Each nation had its own gods, and the powerful force of religion operated to hinder a community of life between the various peoples. The subjugation of these nations by Rome inevitably weakened the

hold of the national gods upon the minds of their worshippers. Roman tolerance or indifference, while it left subject nations free to practise their own religious rites, had the effect of weakening the force of all current religions. The rapidly increasing mingling of diverse peoples brought together every variety of religious belief and worship; the result of which was, a religious eclecticism that passed naturally into scepticism. On every hand there was a decay of the old faiths, and accompanying this degeneration of religions, and partly because of it, was a development of colossal immorality. The Roman conquest, especially of opulent Eastern peoples, resulted in the rapid increase of wealth and luxury in Rome; and this was accompanied by a rapid increase of vice. Popular sports became increasingly sensual and cruel, and even religion was made a minister of lust.

When Christianity entered on its career of spiritual conquest, it found heathenism in a state of indescribable moral degradation. The scathing indictment against pagan morals, which appears in the first chapter of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, seems mild when compared with the testimony of some of the pagans themselves.

Seneca, a contemporary of St. Paul, says: "All things are full of crimes and vices. A great struggle is waged for pre-eminence in iniquity. Daily grows the appetite for sin; daily wanes the sense

of shame. All respect for excellence and justice being cast aside, lust rushes on at will. Crimes are no longer secret; they stalk before the eyes of men. Iniquity is given such a range in public, and is so mighty in the breasts of all, that innocence is not merely rare, it has no existence. Think you that there are only a few individuals who have made an end of law? From all sides, as at a given signal, men have sprung to the task of confounding right and wrong."

Mommsen, the German historian, testifies that, "As a matter of course, morality and family life were treated as antiquated things among all ranks of society. To be poor was not merely the sorest disgrace and the worst crime, but the only disgrace and the only crime: for money the statesman sold the state, and the burgess sold his freedom; the post of the officer and the vote of the jurymen were to be had for money; for money the lady of quality surrendered her person as well as the common courtesan; falsifying of documents and perjuries had become so common that, in a popular poet of this age, an oath is called 'the plaster for debts.' Men had forgotten what honesty was; the person who refused a bribe was regarded, not as an upright man, but as a personal foe. The criminal statistics of all times and countries will hardly furnish a parallel to the dreadful picture of crimes — so varied, so horrible, and so unnatural — which the trial of Aulus Cluentius unrolls before us in

the bosom of one of the most respectable families of an Italian country town."

There seems to have been, beginning in Rome, and spreading to the wealthy centres of the distant provinces, an abandonment to vice that can be described only as a "hunger and thirst for unrighteousness." A consequence of this wide-spread immorality was a growing disgust with life, and finally a passionate or stolid despair, which urged so many to suicide, that this crime against self ceased to attract attention; it was even defended by philosophers as the brave man's only refuge from the appalling evils of life. By the side of this despair, however, there arose, in many quarters, a vague expectancy of some new message to men that should bring deliverance and peace. This expectancy was due partly to the influence of Judaism. The Jews, even before the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, had penetrated all nations. They were numerous especially in Rome, in Alexandria, and in the cities of the far East. The Hebrew Scriptures had been translated into Greek some two centuries before the beginning of the Christian era, and the knowledge of their contents had been more or less widely diffused. The spirit of the Hebrew prophets had undoubtedly affected the minds of men in various quarters of the empire, especially in the East. There were numerous proselytes to the Jewish faith, and there were many others, not proselytes, who undoubtedly were

excited to the anticipation of some new religious revelation which should offer to men a way of escape from the moral chaos into which the world was rapidly falling.

Such, very briefly, were some of the conditions of the world in the midst of which Christianity had its rise and began its work.

We turn now to consider some of the causes of the rise and early growth of Christianity. Most readers of history are familiar with Gibbon's famous statement of these causes. They are: (*a*) the inflexible and intolerant zeal of the early Christians, derived from the Jewish religion; (*b*) their doctrine of future life and future rewards and punishments; (*c*) the miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Church; (*d*) the pure and austere morals of the Christians; (*e*) their closely knit ecclesiastical organization.

Gibbon cleverly evaded any attempt to account for the origin of Christianity, and confined himself to a statement of the causes of its rapid extension after the first century. It should be said, in justice to the simple truth of history, that Gibbon's statement is wanting both in exactness and in entire ingenuousness.

That the early Christians were inflamed by an unquenchable zeal is true; but their zeal was not intolerant, in the sense in which that term can properly be applied to the zeal of the Jewish sectary. They were intolerant of heathen vices and

superstitions, but their intolerance can scarcely be reckoned among the chief influences by which they commended their religion to heathens; especially in view of the fact that Judaism, despite its ethical and spiritual superiority to the Gentile religions, was prevented from extending widely, largely because of the very narrowness and intolerance of its adherents. Besides, towards the best pagan thought, Christian writers, like Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria, were hospitable and even sympathetic.

The early Christians undoubtedly were inspired by a profound conviction of the immortality of the soul, and an invincible belief in the reality of future rewards and punishments; and unquestionably their faith in a future life constituted in itself a powerful appeal to the minds of men. But there is no evidence that, in the first two centuries at least, Christian preachers generally made such use in their preaching of the doctrine of future rewards and punishments as Gibbon implies, and as was made by Christian preachers in later centuries; or even such use of it as was made by Tertullian at the beginning of the third century.

The possession of miraculous powers by the primitive Church would not, of itself, necessarily conduce to the rapid and permanent extension of the Church; and the fact that miraculous powers were ascribed to the Apostolic Church by both friends and foes of Christianity does not have any

great force as an argument that the assumed possession of such powers was a chief cause of its growth, particularly when we consider that the widest extension of Christianity took place after the acknowledged cessation of the apostolic miracles. In only two or three of the early apologists are there reports of contemporary Christian miracles, save such as refer to the healing of demoniacs, and to supernatural visions. The allusion of Irenæus to the contemporary raising of a dead man is indefinite. There is no evidence that the early Christians to any extent either claimed to work miracles themselves, or commended the gospel to pagans on the ground of miraculous powers reposing in the Church. It must be said, however, that such claims were freely made by the founders of heretical sects; and that the exorcism of demons was considered by many a proper function of Christian ministers. But, considering the fact that almost all people of that time, Jews and pagans as well as Christians, believed in miracles, the student of the first three centuries is surprised to find in most of the early Christian writers a singular sanity and reserve on this subject. In this respect they stand far above many later writers. The swarming miracles of ecclesiastical legend nearly all belong to a period subsequent to the Nicene Council. It should be said, also, that miracles, even if they were real, however much they might predispose men to listen, for the time being, to the miracle-

workers, were incapable of producing that faith which issues in holy life and character, and, if they were not real, their inevitable exposure would hinder rather than aid the progress of the doctrines in support of which they were adduced. In either case, therefore, Gibbon's argument at this point breaks down.

The pure and austere morals of the Christians undoubtedly made a profound impression upon corrupt pagan society; but, in so far as those morals were austere they would naturally repel, rather than attract, those who were given up to vice. It is still true that Christian morality, inspired by divine love, did exert a powerful influence in the extension of Christianity; but not, as Gibbon would seem to imply, by virtue of its austerity.

The last cause which Gibbon cites, "the union and discipline of the Christian republic," or, as I have phrased it, the closely knit ecclesiastical organization of the Christians, could have had no great influence on the spread of Christianity until after the middle of the second century. The highly developed organization of the time of Cyprian was the growth of more than two centuries; meanwhile, as early as the beginning of Marcus Aurelius' reign, A. D. 161, Christianity had been diffused throughout the larger part of the Roman empire.

Allowing all reasonable force and scope to the

causes which Gibbon defines, we must still say, *first*, that all of them taken together are inadequate to account for the manifest effect; and, *second*, that these causes themselves need explanation. It is fair to add, as Newman has suggested, that the *combination* of these causes needs also to be accounted for; this, of course, Gibbon does not attempt to do.

It is impossible, in the brief space of a single lecture, to state with any satisfactory fulness the causes of the rise of Christianity, and its development during the first three centuries of the Christian era; but the principle causes may be suggested.

I. The first of these causes is unquestionably the unique and transcendent personality of Jesus Christ. Whatever may be our theories as to His exact metaphysical nature, this, at least, unprejudiced students of history must admit, that in the person of Jesus there came into the world a spiritual force greater than any other to which the history of man witnesses. Attempts have been made by critical minds, through all succeeding centuries, to classify Jesus, and to give Him His true place among the great personalities of the world; but these attempts have mainly served to illustrate the incapacity of the critics. The story may be told in a few simple words, but its significance sweeps beyond the utmost bounds of our comprehension. The Baby, born of a Jewish

mother in Palestine, grew to man's estate and then, announcing Himself as a Messenger sent from God, promulgated the doctrine of God and the scheme of human life that have ever since constituted, and still constitute, the religious and moral ideal of the most spiritual minds of the most advanced peoples in the world, — an ideal that grows in beauty, elevation and power, in proportion as the spirit of man grows in capacity to apprehend the holy and the divine. After three or four years of teaching, this Son of Mary left the world, committing to a handful of disciples the appalling task of conquering the world by means of the Message and the Life which He had imparted to them.

In a narrative, the essential truthfulness of which has never been successfully impeached, we learn that these men, by the power of the inspiration received from their Master, were transformed, after His death, into missionaries and martyrs of the Christian faith. These men, under the influence of the ineradicable conviction that God had truly revealed Himself to them in the Person and teachings of Jesus Christ, did an unexampled work. However numerous may be the subsidiary causes of the development of Christianity in the world, the influence of the personality of Jesus Christ must be placed first. In Him, to a degree beyond that ever exemplified in any other historic personage, God manifested Himself in forms of

human experience, speech, and character. From Him a mighty spiritual force streamed forth upon humanity. It is no accident that the modern world takes its date from the birth of that Baby in the Manger at Bethlehem.

II. The contents of the gospel which the disciples of Jesus preached were of such a character as to be almost self-propagative, in the midst of the conditions that existed in the first century. These contents were: the idea of God as the infinite spiritual Father and Sovereign of the human race; the declaration of the divine love for men, and the divine purpose to save men from sin through forgiveness and the impartation of spiritual energy; and the presentation of a loving, sympathetic, and all-powerful Saviour, who, at once divine and human, endured temptation and trial, suffered death upon the cross for the salvation of sinners, and rose from the dead to make that salvation complete by the fulfilment to men of the hope of eternal life. It was a marvellous gospel of hope, — a God who is absolutely holy, and yet cares for men; a Saviour who is divine, and yet shares in human nature and experience, and mingles freely with the poor and outcast and wicked, having for them only words of kindness and deeds of mercy; and a salvation that gives peace to the conscience, strength to the will in its pursuit of virtue, and boundless satisfaction to the soul.

The Christian message appealed to the noblest susceptibilities of the human reason. The sublimity and simplicity of its doctrines of God and Sin and Salvation; the moral purity and beautiful beneficence of the Life which it inculcated and which Jesus Himself had exemplified; and the grandeur of its doctrines of Creation and Providence, in which the loftiest teachings of the Old Testament are carried up to a higher plane, appealed to the intellect and moral sense of men with a force immeasurably beyond that of the theosophies of the Orient and the philosophies of Greece and Rome.

But the contents of the Christian gospel appealed not only to the highest reason of the thoughtful few, they appealed also to the sensibility of the vast multitude of the poor and the wretched. The doctrine of salvation through a suffering yet triumphant Redeemer brought an efficacious word of hope to every man who desired deliverance from the evils and miseries of human life. Hostile critics, like Celsus, urged, as a reproach against Christianity, that it attracted to itself the lower classes of the people; but this, in truth, was an authentication of its high claims, and a demonstration of its adequacy as a means of salvation. The gospel addressed itself to the most extreme needs of human life, and its success under this severe test was the finest proof of its divine origin.

III. The gospel was propagated through personal communication. At the beginning, Christianity had no schools, no literature, and no wealth. It was embodied in a group of people some of whom had been witnesses of the life and death and resurrection of Jesus, and had learned directly from Him the message which they were to utter; and all of whom had received and, as they believed, continued to receive, from Him, the impulse to carry that message to all the world. Though they but imperfectly comprehended the message and their mission; though the labors of the original apostles had to be supplemented by the much wider labors of the Apostle to the Gentiles; yet, as witnesses of Christ and as disseminators of the faith of Christ, those early missionaries, in their personal quality and their personal action, take a prominent place among the causes of the spread of the Christian faith.

These men were animated by a passionate and persistent love of their Lord. Their characters were transformed, and their action was guided by His spirit. Their enterprise was inspired and directed by the divine purpose which He had revealed. With an entire devotion to Him, they possessed and uttered a lofty and persistent faith amidst wide-spread scepticism; they exhibited a pure morality amidst wide-spread corruption; and they illustrated a disinterested benevolence in contrast with universal selfishness and cruelty. With-

out ostentation and without faltering, they poured out their lives in self-sacrifice that paused at no limits. They at once declared, and in their conduct exhibited, that love for men which was a dominant characteristic and fundamental element of the gospel committed to them. This spirit passed on from these witnesses to others who, through their testimony, espoused the Christian faith, and they, in turn, became missionaries and often martyrs of that faith.

The life of the early Church was, to an extraordinary degree, a life of love. "Nothing," says Uhlhorn, "more astonished the heathen, nothing was more incomprehensible to them. 'Behold,' they exclaim, 'how they love one another!'" Says a pagan in astonishment, "They love each other without knowing each other!" The early Christians not only preached a gospel of love, but they exemplified that gospel in their ministry to the sick, and the poor, and the wretched. "The ancient world," says Uhlhorn again, "was a world without love. There was much that was admirable in it; it produced great men and heroes, but this bond of perfectness was wanting. Whence should love have come? Religion taught none, and awakened none. It taught love to one's native country, obedience to the laws, bravery in war, sacrifice for the greatness and honor of the State — but not philanthropy." But just this pure philanthropy the early Christians taught and prac-

tised. It is a sad illustration of the weakness of human nature, under the temptations brought by increase in numbers and by prosperity, that scarcely was the Church successful in its deadly struggle with heathenism, when it was rent by internecine strife. The development of Christian dogma began the long era of bitter theological controversy, with its accompaniments of division and enmity and conflict, that seems only now slowly drawing toward a close. But before theological strife began, and even afterwards, and in spite of it, the great body of Christians exemplified the power and exhibited the beauty of a love before which multitudes of heathen sank down in astonished and willing subjection. There are many cases on record of persecutors being conquered by the gentleness and sweetness as well as the fortitude of their victims.

In the course of time, the Christians appropriated for their enterprise the various means of literature and education and political influence; the development of ecclesiastical organization also became serviceable to their missionary purpose; but during the nearly three hundred years before the Church, in the person of Constantine, came into unquestioned power in the State, — during those long and weary years in which the Christian faith was outlawed, and Christian believers were subject to all kinds of ignorant and fanatical, or deliberate and malicious, persecution, when upon

her bowed and patient head the Church received storm after storm of bloody oppression, — during all this time, the chief forces by which, in the face of all opposition and through all difficulties, Christianity was extended were: the influence of the personality of its Founder, the appeal of the contents of the gospel which He gave, and the testimony and lives of His disciples and their converts.

It was a struggle for existence by a spiritual faith against the customs, traditions, laws, social organizations, vices, prejudices, and even religions of the entire world.

The triumph of the Christian faith, in spite of these obstacles, in spite of the imperfections of its adherents, and in spite of the corruptions that developed within the Church, is a testimony, which no argument, however subtle and strong, has force to break, — a testimony to the reality and persistence of the divine impulse which was imparted to men in and through the person of Jesus Christ. This triumph was not the triumph merely of creed, — the Church has had many creeds; nor of a system of ecclesiastical organization, — the Church has illustrated many systems; but of a spirit of truth and a life of love emanating from God and becoming the inspiring and architectonic forces of human progress and of all subsequent civilization.

It is at once a modest and a reasonable conclusion to which one of the ablest and wisest Chris-

tian teachers in the middle of the third century thus comes: "In all Greece and in all barbarous races within our world, there are tens of thousands who have left their national laws and customary gods for the law of Moses and the word of Jesus Christ; though to adhere to that law is to incur the hatred of idolaters, and to have embraced that word is to incur the risk of death as well. And considering how, in a few years and with no great store of teachers, in spite of the attacks which have cost us life and property, the preaching of that word has found its way into every part of the world, so that Greeks and barbarians, wise and unwise, adhere to the religion of Jesus, — *doubtless it is a work greater than any work of man.*"

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

IN the last lecture we considered the rise of Christianity and its extension throughout the Roman empire during the first three centuries, and the conditions and causes of its development. We are now to consider the development of the Christian Church as an institution. At first the Church and Christianity were practically identical, but the spiritual force of the gospel soon overflowed all boundaries. There probably has not been a time since the beginning of the Christian era, with the exception of the earliest apostolic period, in which Christianity and the Church have been exactly co-extensive.

In our study of the organization of the early Church we are tracing the process by which the Christian life became organic in human society, and observing the various functions which it developed in its practical struggle for existence. At first Christianity existed without organization. The early Church was a plastic mass, without officers and without specific functions, but unified and vitalized by a common love for Christ, and led by the apostles as original hearers of Christ and wit-

nesses of His resurrection. But this mass of religious protoplasm, or life-stuff, with strong powers of assimilation, quickly became organic. The organization was at first extremely simple, elastic, and free. The exigencies of the situation, however, combined with the inevitable tendency of human nature, soon produced a marked change.

Many persons display great fondness for attempts to trace back the highly differentiated and elaborately organized ecclesiastical systems of the present day to the time of Christ, or at least to the time of the apostles. The attempts are interesting, and on the whole, harmless, but they are also vain. Jesus wrote no book, appointed no officers, in the proper sense of that word, and established no institution. He gave His thought, His life, — in a word, Himself, to His disciples and to the world. His gospel contained within itself the principle of indestructible vitality. It was not a religion, but a revelation and a life. These have inspired religion, created institutions, developed resources, and become organic in manifold forms. The disciples seem at first to have had no idea of forming a church or elaborating a system; full of the faith and enthusiasm which they had derived from the personal Christ, they went forth among men preaching the gospel of divine love and forgiveness and eternal hope. The sphere of their labors at first was Jerusalem, and there thousands of converts soon gathered about the witnesses.

The love which the gospel of Christ awakened showed itself in deeds of charity. The *ecclesia*, or assembly of the believers, became practically communistic. Those who had property shared it with those who had none. Love ruled. The voluntary communism that appeared was not universal, but it was prophetic, and it discloses to us the artlessness of the infant Church. Of this communism Uhlhorn says: "There could be no falser representation of it than to think of it as an institution. . . . We might as well speak of the institution of a community of goods in a family. But as in a family the consciousness of belonging to each other is so strong as entirely to subordinate the individual possessions of each member, so was it in the primitive Church." It was, he continues, "a noble alms-giving, a free equalization of possessions, carried out in the glow of first love to the largest-hearted and greatest extent, and differing, not in kind, but only in degree and extent, from what we subsequently meet with in the church at Jerusalem and elsewhere."

The spectacle which confronts us, as we study the life of those early Christian days, is that of a multitude of men and women rejoicing in a new faith which as yet did not separate them from the old faith, but expanded and enriched it with a new sense of the divine nearness and love; frequenting the temple and synagogues for worship as they had previously done; gathering in the customary places

of popular assembly in order to hear over and over again the testimony of the apostles to the resurrection of Jesus; and meeting in groups at the houses of believers for mutual comfort and edification, and to commemorate their recently departed Lord by breaking bread in the Eucharistic supper.

In all this multitude no one had any authority save the apostles, and their authority, natural and spontaneous, was due to their personal experience and prestige as the immediate disciples of Jesus. There was no new ritual, there were no distinctions of clergy and laity, and there were no ordinances, in the common sense of that term. Any believer might preach; indeed, it is apparent that most believers became involuntary preachers of the gospel. Any believer might baptize, and any believer might administer the Communion. It was the childhood of the Church. The function of the apostles was not primarily that of officers, but rather that of witnesses; but the history of the apostles, so far as it is known, shows that only those who had qualifications for leadership and the work of organization made any permanent impression upon the Church. The increase of the number of believers in Christ very early called for the exercise of leadership and the establishment of some sort of tuition; and the evolution of the Christian Church went on under the influence of the necessities of the case.

Primitive Christianity, in so far as it was a religion, was distinguished from most other religions of the world by being non-sacerdotal. It had no priests and no sacraments. Neither baptism nor the Communion was at first a sacrament. The new faith, by its very nature, implied the immediate communion of every soul with God. The only priesthood was the universal priesthood of believers. It is a significant fact that in the New Testament writings the sacerdotal title is never once conferred on the officers of the infant Church.

Christianity, though it must inevitably take on organization, and adopt methods of teaching and administration, and thus develop characteristic institutions and adequate instruments for its work, was purely and simply a life from God and in God, revealed and mediated by Jesus Christ. None of the institutions that have become so familiar to us as features of the objective manifestation of Christianity were essential to it.

"This," says Lightfoot, "is the Christian ideal: a holy season extending the whole year round; a temple confined only by the limits of the habitable world; a priesthood co-extensive with the human race."

The Church, at first purely a voluntary assembly, retained this simple, elementary character during the time of the apostles. In Jerusalem and elsewhere, under the guidance of the apostles, these

voluntary assemblies chose committees or boards of administration that are designated as presbyters, or bishops, which means simply "elders," or "overseers." Among the Jewish churches, the synagogue with its board of elders naturally served as a model; in the Gentile churches, the society, or guild, which was common among the Gentiles, with its committee of managers, naturally served as a model.

Admission to the Church was by the simplest process imaginable. There were no dogmatic tests of membership, there was no doctrinal examination, and there were no creeds. Confession of belief in Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God, was followed immediately by baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus. Baptism apparently might be administered by any believer. After the development of the clergy, it was usually administered by one of that body; but as late as the end of the second century, baptism by laymen was enjoined by Tertullian whenever none of the clergy could be present. The canons of the Roman Catholic Church still permit a layman or even a woman to baptize; at least, baptism so administered, if the proper matter and form be used, is pronounced valid. The primitive form of baptism was immersion, and for the first thirteen centuries this was the form almost universally observed. The testimony of Stanley on this point is incontrovertible. "Baptism," he says, "was not only a bath, but a

plunge, — an entire submersion in the deep water, a leap as into the rolling sea or the rushing river, where for the moment the waves close over the bather's head, and he emerges again as from a momentary grave; or it was the shock of a shower-bath, — a rush of water passed over the whole person from capacious vessels, so as to wrap the recipient as within the veil of a splashing cararact." In another place he declares that "for the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice of baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word 'baptize,' — that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed into the water. That practice is still continued in Eastern churches. In the Western church it still lingers amongst Roman Catholics in the solitary instance of the cathedral at Milan; amongst Protestants in the numerous sect of the Baptists. It lasted long into the Middle Ages. Even the Icelanders, who at first shrank from the waters of their freezing lakes, were reconciled when they found that they could use the warm water of the Geysers. And the cold climate of Russia has not been found an obstacle to its continuance throughout that vast empire. Even in the Church of England it is still observed in theory. The rubric in the Public Baptism for Infants enjoins that, unless for special causes, they are to be dipped, not sprinkled. Edward the Sixth and Elizabeth were both immersed."

As I have already said, under the exigencies of the Christian communities various offices arose. Capacity to hold office was regarded as a gift from the Holy Spirit and was called a *charisma*, which means literally a gift of grace. There were gifts of ruling, of teaching, of prophesying, of tongues, of discerning the spirits, and of evangelizing. The apostles themselves evidently regarded these functions as gifts.

As yet the entire body of Christians was upon one level, indicated by the phrase, "all ye are brethren." Says Hatch: "The distinctions which St. Paul makes between Christians are based, not upon office, but upon varieties of spiritual power. They are caused by the diversity of the operations of the Holy Spirit. They are consequently personal and individual. They do not mark off class from class, but one Christian from another. Some of these spiritual powers are distinguished from others by a greater visible and outward effect; but they are all the same in kind."

Among these various offices two very soon became tolerably well-defined, and out of one of these developed a third; and these three ultimately became the three characteristic and permanent offices of the Christian Church. The history of the growth of these three offices is the history of the organization of the Church.

I have already alluded to the creation of boards of administration consisting of presbyters or bish-

ops; but it will be advisable to take up the three offices and study them somewhat in detail. The apostles were at first the sole directors of the Christian communities which were created by their efforts; but the multiplication of Christian communities outside of Palestine made this personal apostolic supervision impracticable. The necessity for the creation of some sort of administration is therefore apparent. During the lifetime of the apostles there existed two classes of administrative officers: deacons and presbyters, or bishops. The latter were also called shepherds, or pastors. Only these two kinds of officers appear during apostolic times. Between the epistles of St. Paul and the epistles of Ignatius (110–117 A. D.), a period of about fifty years, we have little information on the growth of the Church. Before the middle of the second century each church, or organized Christian community, had three orders of ministers: its bishop, its presbyters, and its deacons, — though this is *certainly* true, at that early date, only of the churches in Syria and Asia Minor, and the church in Rome.

The first of these three offices which appears in the Acts of the Apostles is that of the deacons. Following the chronological order, therefore, we shall consider, —

1. *Deacons.* — The word "deacon," διάκονος, means "minister," "servant," "attendant." The origin of the word is uncertain. It was once thought to be

derived from the compound διά and κόνις, which would mean "raising dust by hastening." In the New Testament the word διάκονος is used many times in the general sense of "minister" or "servant," and only three times (Phil. i. 1, and 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12) in the technical sense of "deacon." The verb διακονέω is used many times to designate the act of ministering or serving, and but twice (1 Tim. iii. 10, 13) to designate the exercise of the office of deacon. This term is applied to Peter's mother-in-law, who, after she had been healed of the fever by Jesus, it is said, "rose and ministered unto them" (διηκόνει, Mark i. 31). The substantive διακονία is often used in the New Testament to designate ministry, or service, or administration; but never once with the technical sense of deaconship. The word, however, was soon appropriated to a specific office in the Church. That office, the diaconate, appears to have had its origin in the incident told in the sixth chapter of the Acts. In that chapter we have a most interesting glimpse of the first Christian community, — a glimpse which reveals to us the significant fact that the earliest activities of the Church were those of practical charity. A dispute had arisen between the Hebrews and Hellenists over the matter of providing food for the widows and other dependents of the Christian community. The apostles, powerfully urged by their inward impulse to the work of preaching, sought to be relieved from the care of

this administration, which up to this time had rested entirely upon them. They therefore asked for the appointment of "seven men of good repute, full of the spirit of wisdom," whom they proposed to appoint over the business; meantime they would give themselves more freely to the ministry of the word.

We have here two functions brought into suggestive comparison, in reference to which the same word, *διακονία*, is used. These are the ministry of the tables (*διακονία τῶν τραπέζων*), and the ministry of the word (*διακονία τοῦ λόγου*). The latter of these the apostles appropriated to themselves; the former they referred to the "seven good men" who were chosen for that purpose. These seven men are never called deacons in the New Testament, but only "the Seven." Two of them, Stephen and Philip, almost immediately became distinguished preachers and evangelists, though preaching was not any part of the function for which they were specifically chosen. Assuming that the diaconate originated in the appointment of these seven men, we see that it sprang out of the earliest needs of the Christian community in Jerusalem. There was no office corresponding to it in the synagogue, as was clearly the case with the presbyterate. In the epistles of St. Paul the term "deacons" occurs in such a way as to indicate that the office was early established. The fact that "the Seven" were never called deacons, and that several, at least, were

laborious and successful preachers of the gospel, one of whom, Stephen, on account of the hostility which his preaching stirred up among the unchristian Jews in Jerusalem, became the first martyr of the Church, has led some to infer that their appointment does not mark the beginning of the diaconate; but on the whole it is reasonable to conclude that the appointment of "the Seven" to administer the charity of the church in Jerusalem was the real origin of the office. Against this, Uhlhorn contends that "the Seven" were not the original deacons, but the first elders, citing in proof the fact that St. Luke never again mentions the Seven in the church of Jerusalem, although he does mention presbyters, and that the Evangelist gives no other account of the institution of the presbytery; and he maintains that "the management of works of mercy, of alms-giving, was never conceded to the deacons. It was in the hands of the presbyters and afterwards of the bishops, and the deacons only gave their assistance. And this is, in general, the position of deacons in the organism of the Church." He also claims that originally the deacons were not appointed officers, but volunteers, who freely gave their services to the Church. "Those," he says, "who had the requisite gifts and love, rendered of their own accord the service afterwards allotted to the deacons, and it was not till the increase of the Church rendered this needful that a regular office grew up out of

the free gift and love." In his view the diaconate is an office which properly belongs to any Christian who will fill it. In this the deacon differs radically from the presbyter. "Not every Christian is a presbyter; but every one is really and naturally a deacon, a servant of all."

It was the main function of deacons (and of deaconesses, for we read of the latter also in the New Testament) to look after the poor and dispense the gifts of the Church under the supervision of the presbyters or bishops. "The diaconate," says Stanley, "was the oldest ecclesiastical function, the most ancient of the holy orders. It was grounded on the elevation of the care of the poor to the rank of a religious service. It was a proclamation of the truth that social questions are to take the first place amongst religious instruction. It was the recognition of political economy as a part of religious knowledge."

Deacons are always spoken of in conjunction with presbyters or bishops. The office passed from the church in Jerusalem to other churches, and, in 62 A. D., we find deacons as well as presbyters in the Philippian church. In later times the deacons became stewards of the property of the church and of the funds belonging to widows and orphans. It was their duty to visit the sick and the afflicted and report to the bishop. In time of persecution they visited confessors in prison to bear to them the messages and gifts of

their brethren, and to minister, as far as was allowed, to their needs; and they buried the bodies of martyrs. The discipline of the church was also intrusted to them as ministers to the bishop, and under his direction they sought out, reproved, and if possible recovered, offenders.

For a long time it would appear that the number of deacons in any single community was limited to seven. This fact seems to indicate that the office had its origin in the appointment of Stephen and Philip and their companions. In 315 A. D. a canon of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea enacted that there should be no more than seven deacons in any society. A certain latitude was secured, however, by the appointment of subdeacons.

2. *Presbyters.* — "Presbyter," or "elder," πρεσβύτερος, is a Jewish term and indicates a well-known office in the synagogue. The Acts of the Apostles gives us no account of the institution of the presbytery, probably because the office was naturally and immediately transferred from the synagogue to the church.

The persecution of the Christians which followed the stoning of Stephen had the result of spreading the gospel to Samaria, Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch in Syria. Indirectly it had the further result of giving to the Church that incomparable missionary genius, St. Paul.

James, the brother of John, who had been practically the head of the church in Jerusalem, was put

to death by Herod Agrippa. The persecution increased the felt need of a recognized head of the church, and James, the brother of Jesus, by virtue of his personal character as well as his relationship to the Lord, became the president of the Jerusalem community. The apostle Peter had devoted himself to preaching the gospel beyond Jerusalem, but he returned to Jerusalem, where, with James and John, he participated in the Council that assembled to consider the questions which arose through the conversion of the Gentiles and the formation of Gentile Christian communities under the preaching of Paul and Barnabas.

Personal apostolic supervision, even of Palestinian Christian communities, was of necessity limited. The apostles naturally were the first points of attack in times of persecution, and, besides, the growth of the churches soon carried them beyond the ability of so small a number of men to look after their needs. There appear to have arisen in the churches bodies of men to whom was committed the duty of supervision and administration. These undoubtedly were presbyters, or elders, and following closely the model furnished by the synagogue, the presbytery was a sort of local sanhedrim. Paul and Barnabas, in their missionary work, at first confined themselves to their fellow-countrymen in Gentile lands; but soon they were driven out of the synagogues, and then they began rapidly to form Christian com-

munities among the Gentiles. These communities apparently were modelled after the societies or guilds that were so common at that time. Over these communities the apostles appointed presbyters, or elders, as the Jews would call them, or, as they would more naturally be called in Gentile communities, overseers, that is, bishops.

These presbyters, or bishops, were to watch over the Christian flocks, to direct them in their worship, and serve to the poor. They also exercised discipline and looked after the morals of the Christians. The presbyters were not specifically teachers, though a presbyter who had the necessary qualifications might exercise the teaching function. Among the presbyters, and outside of that body, there were teachers consisting of men who showed themselves possessed of the gifts of prophecy and aptness to teach.

The eldership rapidly developed into a permanent congregational office. The development through which this office passed leads us to the consideration of —

3. *Bishops.* — The word "bishop," ἐπίσκοπος, is a pagan word and means, literally, *overseer.* The first function which it designated was one that grew out of the charitable activities of the church. The overseer received, and through the deacons administered, the church funds for the poor. During the first century, at least until after the death of St. Paul, there was no distinction be-

tween presbyters and overseers, or bishops; but probably as early as the last years of the century, and possibly with the sanction and under the guidance of St. John in Asia Minor, one of the presbyters or bishops in each church became chairman or president, and thus the later bishop in embryo.

At first the terms "bishop" and "presbyter" were interchangeable; then the bishop was called also "presbyter," though the presbyter was not called "bishop." The title, previously common to all the presbyters, was thus appropriated to one. This appropriation, however, could scarcely have taken place much before the end of the first or the early years of the second century; certainly this is true of the Christian communities among the heathen. "As late," says Lightfoot, "as the year 70 no distinct signs of the episcopal government had appeared in Gentile Christendom." Before the middle of the second century, however, we find the office of bishop quite clearly defined.

In the letters of Ignatius (110–117 A. D.) the episcopate appears in so advanced a stage of development as to indicate that the development had been going on in the East for some years. This development was perhaps stimulated among Jewish Christians by the fall of Jerusalem and the loss of a visible centre. But in all Christian communities the need of some unifying force in organization and administration was early felt;

this need become more urgent as, through the increase of pagan hostility, the existence of the church seemed to grow more and more precarious. In Asia Minor the episcopate, as I have already suggested, *may* have had its beginning under the eye and even with the initiative of St. John, though, it must be admitted, of this there is no evidence. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who met a martyr's death in 155 or 156 A. D., at the advanced age of eighty-six years, was the disciple of St. John. As early as 110 Polycarp is addressed as the bishop of Smyrna by Ignatius; and it is supposed that Polycarp was appointed to this office by St. John. At any rate it is clear that the episcopacy developed rapidly in Asia Minor, though in Macedonia and Greece it was of much slower growth. It is a fair inference that there were no bishops in these latter countries as late as 125 A. D., or even later. In Corinth the episcopate was established probably as the result of feuds and controversies in the Corinthian church, though it was not in existence there as late as 97, the date of Clement's letter from Rome. In Rome, if we are to attach any significance to the silence of Ignatius in his letter to the Romans, the episcopate had not developed as late as 110 or 117; but it must have appeared soon after this time. Its growth in Rome was vigorous and rapid.

The idea of the episcopate, as a continuation of the apostolate and its authority in the Church,

was suggested as early as the time of Irenæus (177–200). The Christian churches in Gaul were planted from Asia Minor, there being a racial kinship between the Galatians and the Gauls, and probably they began with the episcopal form of organization. The episcopate could not have been definitively established in Gaul at this time, however, since even Irenæus uses the terms "bishops" and "presbyters" interchangeably. In Africa, which was christianized from Rome, episcopacy was introduced early and rapidly extended. In the time of Hippolytus, near the beginning of the third century, the idea of the episcopate had developed far toward the hierarchical view which it attained under Cyprian in the middle of the same century. In 189 Victor, the bishop of Rome, first claimed universal dominion. This claim was vigorously and somewhat scornfully denied by Tertullian, and a similar claim was ignored or denied by Cyprian fifty years later.

Quite early the president-bishop began to lay claim to the teaching as well as to the ruling function. The presbyters retained the position of advisers of the bishop, and later shared also in the sacerdotal functions, and, during the vacancy of the episcopal office, took the guidance of the church. In preaching and the care of souls they acted on the commission and with the approbation of the bishop. Already that process was begun which Hatch thus describes: "By one of those slow and

silent revolutions which the lapse of many centuries brings about in political as well as in religious communities, the ancient conception of the office as essentially disciplinary and collegiate, has been superseded by a conception of it in which not only is a single presbyter competent to discharge all a presbyter's functions, but in which also those functions are primarily, not those of discipline, but the 'ministration of the Word and Sacraments.'"

In early times there was a bishop wherever in later times we find a parish church, and the chief function of the bishop was one of administration; but gradually he absorbed also the functions of administering baptism and the Communion. An interesting survival of this appears in the rite of Confirmation. "No baptism," says Hatch, "is theoretically complete until the bishop has taken that part in it which once followed immediately upon immersion, but which is now come to have the semblance of a separate rite, and is known as Confirmation."

The development of the episcopate was not uniform; as we have seen, it was more rapid in Asia Minor than it was in Gaul and Greece. Even in the fifth century it was the custom of the bishop to address the presbyters as "fellow-presbyters;" and this custom was not questioned till the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. Jerome, who wrote about the end of the

fourth century, says: "Bishops and presbyters are the same, for the one is a term of dignity, the other of age." Again, "If any one thinks the opinion that bishops and presbyters are the same to be, not the view of the Scriptures, but my own, let him study the words of the apostle to the Philippians." Still again, "As presbyters know that by the custom of the church they are subject to him who shall have been set over them, so let bishops also be aware that they are superior to presbyters more owing to custom than to any actual ordinance of the Lord." In another place he says: "At Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist down to the times of the bishops Heraclas (233–249) and Dionysius (249–265), the presbyters always nominated as bishops one chosen out of their own body and placed in a higher grade; just as if an army were to appoint a general, or deacons were to choose from their own body one whom they knew to be diligent and call him archdeacon."

At first presbyters, or bishops, and deacons were not distinguished from the laity, save by the fact of their exercising certain functions in the service of the church. They still pursued their customary secular vocations. Even in the third century we find Cyprian cautioning the clergy not to give so much time to matters of business, and protesting against their acceptance of civil offices. Although the distinction between

clergy and laity must have begun to appear early in the second century, even as late as the time of Cyprian (248–258 A. D.) the laity were not entirely excluded from a share in the management of the church.

With the growth of the hierarchical idea, the rural bishops, who naturally deferred to bishops of metropolitan cities of the Roman provinces, looking to them for advice and guidance, gradually became subordinate to them in authority as well as in dignity. This was due chiefly to the superior rank of the metropolitan cities. The theory of apostolic succession, suggested by Irenæus and elaborated by Cyprian, naturally emphasised the importance of those cities which had been the scenes of apostolic labor, and the bishops of those cities soon took precedence of the ordinary metropolitans. To these the designation, "archbishop," which at first was applied to all metropolitans, was ultimately confined. The influence of the imperial idea upon the Church appears in the deference which, particularly in the Western churches, was early paid to the church in Rome. The bishop whose seat was in the capital of the world naturally drew to himself a consideration like that given to no other official of the Church. The association of the apostles, St. Paul and St. Peter, with the Roman church, and, later, the tradition that St. Peter was the founder of that church, tended also to increase the authority of its bishop. The claim that St.

Peter founded the church in Rome, was not heard until 170 A. D.; it was a baseless claim, but it had a powerful charm for the minds of men, especially among Western Christians, and in later centuries it was urged with such vigor that finally it became dominant throughout the West. Now for many centuries it has been the proud boast of the Roman pontiffs that they are the successors of St. Peter. But, while the Roman bishop had considerable influence as early as the third century, no dictation from him was allowed during the period to which our study is confined; nor was it ever allowed in the Eastern Church. Even Cyprian, who may be considered the founder of the theory that the bishops are the divinely ordained successors of the apostles, maintained that the bishops are on a footing of perfect equality; "each of them is a successor of Peter, and an heir of the promise given indeed to Peter first, but given to him *for all the others*."

In the controversy over the Easter question, the high-handed course taken by Victor in excommunicating what were called the Quarto-deciman churches (the churches that observed the fourteenth Nisan as the anniversary of Jesus' death) was condemned even by the churches who were in agreement with him, and his excommunication was disregarded.

The development of the episcopate into a closely knit hierarchy, a process that was well on

its way by the middle of the third century, was due in part to the necessity for unity and harmony in the midst of the distractions which beset the Church, and to the desire for the preservation of orthodoxy. The rise of heresies and sects in the Church, particularly the inroads of Gnosticism in its various forms, led to a demand for the enforcement of a "rule of faith." This "rule of faith" was the apostolic tradition, supposed to be preserved especially by bishops who occupied apostolic seats. By the time of Irenæus this had grown substantially into the form which was known in after times as "the Apostles' Creed." The episcopate thus became the centre of unity and the depositary of apostolic tradition. The growth of the idea of the episcopate during the first three centuries has been clearly and succinctly sketched by Lightfoot. In the following words I summarize his statement. With Ignatius, the bishop is the centre and bond of ecclesiastical unity; with Irenæus he is the depositary of apostolic tradition; with Cyprian he is the absolute vicegerent of Christ in things spiritual. "Cyprian," he says, "regards the bishop as exclusively the representative of God to the congregation and hardly, if at all, as the representative of the congregation before God. The bishop is the indispensable channel of divine grace, the indispensable bond of Christian brotherhood. The episcopate is not so much the roof, as the foundation stone of

the ecclesiastical edifice; not so much the legitimate development, as the primary condition of the Church. The bishop is appointed directly by God, is responsible directly to God, is inspired directly from God."

The development of the hierarchy in the Church was naturally accompanied or followed by the rise and development of sacerdotalism. The sacerdotal idea is entirely absent from the New Testament, and also from the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Ignatius never regards the ministry as a sacerdotal office. Polycarp knows nothing of sacerdotal duties or privileges. Justin Martyr, though he speaks at length of the Eucharistic offerings, says nothing of any sacerdotal functions save such as belong to the whole Christian body, — all are priests. Irenæus also, and Clement of Alexandria, and even Origen, are free from any trace of sacerdotalism.

The sacerdotal idea appears germinally near the close of the second century. Tertullian is the first who asserts sacerdotal claims on behalf of the ministry, and even he seems to hold that the church, for convenience, has entrusted to the clergy sacerdotal functions which belong to the whole congregation. Says Ritschl: "The distinction between the active and the passive members of the congregation, — in other words, the Catholic conception of the priesthood, — is foreign to the first two centuries."

Cyprian however, advanced to a definite sacerdotal position, and from his time on, the priestly conception of the Christian ministry grew until it completely dominated the office. For nearly or quite two centuries the office of the Christian minister was representative: it was that of an ambassador, and that of a teacher and leader; afterwards it became vicarial, and, instead of ambassadors of God, the priests were His vicars.

An important feature of ecclesiastical administration is the Synod or Council. Diocesan synods appear to have been held very early in Asia Minor. Traces of such bodies are found as early as the middle of the second century. In the third century synods were frequent, though none rose above the dignity of provincial councils. During the latter half of this century they were held at least annually, in almost every province of Christendom; in Asia Minor they were held semi-annually. These synods were called by metropolitan bishops to deal with important questions of doctrine and administration. They were composed of bishops, presbyters and deacons, and sometimes laymen also by invitation; but usually only bishops signed the decrees, and gradually the lay element was excluded. Important synodal decisions were communicated to distant bishops, and thus these bodies tended to promote unity in the doctrine and practice of the Church, and accelerated the development and centralization of ecclesiastical

authority. From these decisions there was gradually formed a body of ecclesiastical law.

A synod was alleged to have been held in Sicily against the Gnostic, Heracleon, as early as 125 A. D., and another in Rome under the bishop Telesphorus before 139; but there is no historical evidence of either, and, besides, Heracleon, who is the earliest known commentator on the Fourth Gospel, scarcely could have taught earlier than 150. The earliest synods that are known were called to deliberate on the Montanist heresy in Asia Minor about 156, or a little later. Toward the end of the century synods were held in Palestine, Pontus, Gaul, Mesopotamia, at Ephesus, and in Rome (under Victor), in connection with the controversy over the time for observing the Easter festival. Still other synods of which we have some record were held concerning the validity of heretical baptism; the heresies of Beryllus, Sabellius, and Paul of Samosata; the irregular ordination of Origen; and various other exigencies of church discipline. There was a synod in North Africa about 215 A. D., one in Iconeum in 256, and seven under Cyprian in Carthage between 248 and 256. A council at Elvira in Spain, in 305 or 306 A. D., issued the first recorded decree on the celibacy of the clergy. In Arles, in Southern Gaul, a synod was held in 314 in which Britain and nearly, or quite, all of the other Western provinces were represented by bishops.

There was no Œcumenical Council until after the conversion of Constantine. The Council of Nicæa, in 325, was the first of a series of great councils, the decisions of which shaped the doctrine and ecclesiastical policy of the Church for many centuries, and still shape the policy of the Church throughout a large part of Christendom.

It remains for me to give some account of the worship of the early Church and of the development of sacramentalism in the estimation and use of the Christian ordinances. The religious life of the early Church, as well as its organization, was more or less influenced by the conditions amidst which it rose. In Palestine, where the churches were composed exclusively of Jews, there was at first very little change in the forms of worship. Christians frequented the temple and the synagogues, and continued to observe the Sabbath and the Passover.

In the churches beyond Palestine both synagogues and Gentile religious associations probably influenced the religious customs of Christians, for in these churches there were both Jews and Gentiles. The influence of the Jewish element in the churches of Asia Minor is very apparent in the controversy over the time for the celebration of the Easter festival which agitated Christendom during the latter part of the second and the whole of the third centuries. The churches in Asia Minor contended that the annual commemoration

of the death of Christ should be observed on the fourteenth of the Hebrew month Nisan, regardless of the day of the week on which this might fall. Accordingly, on the fourteenth of Nisan they ended the Lenten fast with the celebration of the Eucharist as the Christian's paschal feast. In Rome, however, and the churches of the West, it was contended that the Hebrew calendar should be discarded, and that the observance of Easter should always be upon the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox. The controversy over this question is known as the Quarto-deciman controversy. It practically ended with the Council of Nicæa in 325.

The celebration of Easter as a Christian festival, it should be said, appears not to have arisen, or to have become at all general, until sometime in the second century. There is no trace of this celebration either in the New Testament or the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Socrates, the Church historian (c. 385–430 A. D.) says: "The Saviour and His apostles have enjoined us by no law to keep this feast. . . . The apostles had no thought of appointing festival days, but of promoting a life of blamelessness and piety. And it seems to me that the feast of Easter has been introduced into the Church from some old usage, just as many other customs have been established."

The influence of Hebrew custom, as illustrated in the synagogue, appears in the free and simple

forms of worship that characterized the apostolic church. There was reading from the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament, followed by exegetical and practical addresses from any who were moved by the Spirit to speak. In later times a letter from one of the apostles was also read, and, still later, portions from one of the gospels. After the final settlement of the New Testament canon, the custom became fixed of reading in worship selections from both the Old and New Testaments, a custom which has survived until the present day.

There were prayers, which soon followed prescribed forms, repetitions of the Lord's Prayer and the singing of psalms. In addition to psalms, Christian hymns began to appear in worship as early, probably, as the time of St. Paul. It is thought that fragments of some of these Christian hymns are found in his epistles; as, for example:

> Awake thou that sleepest,
> And rise from the dead,
> And Christ shall give thee light.
>
> EPH. V. 14.

> He who was manifested in the flesh,
> Justified in the spirit,
> Seen of angels,
> Preached among the nations,
> Believed on in the world,
> Received up in glory.
>
> 1 TIM. III. 16.

He that would love life,
And see good days,
Let him refrain his tongue from evil,
And his lips that they speak no guile, etc.

1 PETER III. 10, 12.

This last is adapted with a slight modification from the 34th Psalm.

Before the end of the second century there was an interesting development of Christian hymnology. The Evening Hymn of the Greek Church, Φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης, is attributed to Athenogenes, who was martyred about 175 A. D. It is familiar to English readers through the metrical translations, or paraphrases, by Keble, Eddis, and Dr. Bethune. I give a literal translation: —

"Glad Light of the holy glory,
Of the Immortal Heavenly Father,
Holy, Blessed Jesus Christ,
Coming to the setting sun,
Beholding the evening light,
We hymn Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, God.
Worthy art Thou, in all seasons, to be hymned with pious voices,
O Son of God, who givest life;
Wherefore the world glorifies Thee."

About the end of the second century Bardesanes and his son, Harmonius, wrote many hymns which were very popular in the Syrian churches. Among the most notable of the early Christian hymns is the *Gloria in Excelsis*. The following

hymn is attributed to Clement of Alexandria. I quote from the literal translation, a part of which may be found in the first volume of Dr. Sheldon's "History of the Christian Church." As Dr. Sheldon says, "it is little else than a chain of epithets descriptive of the offices of Christ."

"Bridle of untamed colts,
Wing of unwandering birds,
Sure helm of babes,
Shepherd of royal lambs!
Assemble thy simple children
To praise holily,
To hymn guilelessly
With innocent mouths
Christ the guide of children,

O King of saints,
All-subduing Word
Of the most high Father,
Prince of wisdom,
Support of sorrows,
That rejoicest in the ages,
Jesus, Saviour
Of the human race,
Shepherd, Husbandman,
Helm, bridle,
Heavenly Wing,
Of the all-holy flock,
Fisher of men
Who are saved,
Catching the chaste fishes
With sweet life
From the hateful wave
Of a sea of vices, —

Guide [us] Shepherd, of rational sheep;
Guide unharmed children,
O holy King," etc.[1]

In the early assemblies for worship great freedom of address was allowed. Whoever had a charismatic endowment might speak. All Christians participated in the worship until after the middle of the second century; then worship began to be looked upon, not only as a service to God which was obligatory, but even as having a merit of its own; then the worship was gradually appropriated by the clergy, and finally the distinction between "the active and the passive members of the congregation" became complete.

In the beginning the Hebrew Christians continued to keep the Jewish Sabbath, but the first day of the week also was observed in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, — not, however, like the Jewish Sabbath, by cessation from manual labor. The Lord's day, as almost from the beginning it was called, was observed by meetings for joyful worship, in which the attitude of prayer usually was standing, and for the celebration of the Eucharist. The distinction of days was natural to the Jewish Christians, and under Jewish influence it tended to appear in Gentile churches. especially in Asia Minor. This tendency St. Paul resisted. In

[1] The whole of the literal translation of which the above is but the first half, and also a very good metrical version, may be found in Volume IV. of the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library."

accordance with the genius of the Christian faith, he maintained that all days were sacred, and threw the whole weight of his influence against the tendency to Judaize Christianity. For a time his influence prevailed, but the tendency was too strong, and, although most of the Jewish rites passed away, the tendency survived; and during a large part of its history the Christian Church has exhibited the Judaistic spirit of devotion to sacred days and seasons and ceremonies.

As the churches in Palestine declined, or largely lost their distinctively Jewish character by the incoming of Gentiles after the destruction of Jerusalem, the observance of the Sabbath gradually disappeared. The Lord's day did not, however, immediately take its place, save in the single sense that it became a day for Christian worship. Not until about the year 200 do we meet with recommendations to Christians to abstain wholly from secular labor on Sunday. Abstinence from secular labor on that day was not made compulsory by the church until as late as the Council of Laodicea in 363 A. D.; though as early as 321 Constantine legally recognized the exceptional character of the day "by forbidding the courts of justice to hold their sessions on that day, except for the humane purpose of manumitting slaves. He also commanded his soldiers to refrain from their customary military exercises."

Dr. Fisher, from whom I quote, adds that "the

public games, however, still continued to attract many from the proper observance of Sunday and of the Church festivals. But in 425 a law was passed forbidding all games on such days."

The ascetical tendency, which appeared very early in the church, developed rapidly in the second century; it shows itself in the emphasis that was laid on fasting and the custom of observing Wednesdays and Fridays until 3 o'clock in the afternoon as fast days, and also in the growing dis position to attach special value to virginity and celibacy. The observance of Wednesday as a fast day ceased after a time, but Friday continued to be kept, in memory of Christ's passion. The "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" says: "Let not your fasts be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week; but ye shall fast on the fourth and the preparation day," — that is, Wednesday and Friday.

The tendency of the Church toward sacramentalism began to appear in connection with the two ordinances, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. At first baptism was symbolically a confession of faith in Christ and a pledge of obedience to Him: associated with this was, of course, the idea of cleansing from sin. Its form, immersion, vividly suggested a burial and resurrection; therefore, from the beginning almost, it carried with it the idea of a birth. Even in apostolic times the act of baptism seems to have been intimately asso-

ciated with the idea of regeneration. In the earliest writings after the New Testament, we find expressions indicating that it was believed to have a mystical efficacy. The term "Baptism," was sometimes used as the equivalent of regeneration and conversion. In the "Teaching of the Twelve" there is no clear intimation of this idea, but the idea is fairly ascribed to Ignatius, and it is found quite explicitly in the writings of Justin Martyr. The latter says concerning converts: "They are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated." Speaking of the Eucharist, he uses the following language: "Of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined." In another place, discoursing of righteousness, Justin says: "We have believed, and testify that that very baptism which he (Isaiah) announced is alone able to purify those who have repented; and this is the water of life." Tertullian, although he was inclined to postpone baptism on account of the supposed deadliness of sins committed after receiving that ordinance, thus writes: "Happy is the sacrament of our water, in that, by washing away the sins of our early blindness, we are set free [and admitted] into eternal life! . . . We, little fishes, after the example of our

ΙΧΘΥΣ, Jesus Christ, are born in water, nor have we safety in any other way than by permanently abiding in water. And so that most monstrous creature, who had no right to teach even sound doctrine, knew full well how to kill the little fishes, by taking them away from the water!" Tertullian here alludes to some one whom he stigmatizes as the "viper of the Cainite heresy." In another place Tertullian argues vigorously against doubts that baptism is necessary to salvation. Cyprian expresses his conviction of the necessity of baptism even more strongly than Tertullian. He says: "In order that, according to the divine arrangement and the evangelical truth, they may be able to obtain remission of sins, and to be sanctified, and to become temples of God, they must all absolutely be baptized with the baptism of the Church who come from adversaries and antichrists to the Church of Christ." He also explicitly makes baptism the means of regeneration. "One is not born by the imposition of hands when he receives the Holy Spirit, but in baptism, that so, being already born, he may receive the Holy Spirit."

About the middle of the third century, therefore, the sacramental doctrine of baptism, though it was not fully formulated until the time of Augustine, had become so far fixed that the rite was conceived as necessary to salvation. In primitive times believers were baptized immediately upon

their confession of faith in Christ. The baptism was an immersion which quite early became threefold. "The Teaching of the Twelve" is the first Christian document that seems to recognize any other form. It says: "If thou hast not living water, baptize into other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water thrice upon the head into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This writing certainly is as early as the first decade of the second century, and probably it belongs to the last years of the first century.

After a time, as a cautionary measure, baptism was delayed, and the Catechumenate was formed. As early as the persecution under Pliny, in Asia Minor, the Lord's Supper, which till that time had been celebrated in the evening in connection with the "love-feast," was joined to the preaching service, and the love-feast was abandoned, in order to avoid the appearance of violating the law against secret meetings. The danger to which the church was exposed afterwards caused the exclusion of all heathens from the preaching service. Care was necessary, also, in receiving professed converts lest those should gain admittance to the church who were spies and enemies. Some means, therefore, was required by which those who avowed themselves believers, or, at least, desirous of becoming Christians, could safely be brought into full mem-

bership in the Church. The means devised was the Catechumenate.

Catechumens were those who, having expressed the wish to become Christians, were put under instruction, and were therefore naturally in preparation for baptism. Of these there were four classes: (1) *inquirers*, — those who were sufficiently interested to receive private instruction; (2) *hearers*, — those who were allowed to attend public preaching and to hear the reading of the gospel; (3) *genuflectentes*, — those who had already asked for baptism, and were allowed to participate in the prayers of the congregation; (4) the *electi* or *competetentes*, — those who, having passed the period of probation, were ready to receive baptism.

In the larger churches, quite early, there seem to have been catechists appointed for the special instruction of catechumens. In Alexandria and Carthage catechetical schools were founded, but they were not general, and, strange to say, there is no evidence of any such institution in Rome. The catechetical school in Alexandria rose to a position of great influence through the teaching of its celebrated masters, Clement and Origen.

In early days baptism was administered at any time, but late in the period which we are studying the custom became general of administering it only on one of the great days of the Church, and it was finally confined to the season of Easter and

Pentecost. The growth of the sacramental conception of baptism undoubtedly led to the early adoption of infant baptism; of infant baptism, however, there is no absolutely certain record before the time of Cyprian.

Dr. Schaff, I believe, held a different view, but I have been unable to find any evidence invalidating this statement. The reference in Irenæus is uncertain, and Tertullian opposed infant baptism, which would seem to indicate that it was introduced as a novelty in his time. A different inference, however, is tenable. In an epistle to Fidus, giving the judgment of a council of sixty-six bishops in opposition to the opinion that baptism, like circumcision, should be delayed until the eighth day after birth, Cyprian says: "This was our opinion in council, that by us no one ought to be hindered from baptism and from the grace of God, who is merciful and kind and loving to all. Which, since it is to be observed and maintained in respect of all, we think it to be even more observed in respect of infants and newly born persons, who on this very account deserve more from our help and from the divine mercy, that immediately, on the very beginning of their birth, lamenting and weeping, they do nothing else but entreat."

The Lord's Supper was originally observed in private houses or in hired rooms. A group of believers, or a believing household, participated in a joyful evening meal, called *ἀγάπη*, or love-feast;

after which, the one who presided handed round the bread and wine as Jesus had done. This custom seems to have continued through the apostolic period. Later, as we have seen, the Supper was attached to public worship, and near the end of the second century non-communicants were dismissed before the celebration of the Eucharist. This was due in part, doubtless, to the danger of persecution, which led to privacy, but it was due also to changed ideas of the Supper and the consequent dread of profanation. Perhaps too the example of the heathen mysteries had some influence. The bread and wine were contributed by the communicants and distributed by the deacons. Very early the conception of the Eucharist as an offering arose. The elements, being the gifts of the flock, were looked upon as their offering to God, but they were not in any sense considered an offering of the body and blood of Christ.

The common practice was for the communion to be observed on every Sunday. It also attended every event of exceptional importance, as, for example, the anniversary of the death of a loved one. The day of a martyr's death was counted his birthday, and was celebrated at his burial-place by prayers and other acts of worship, and by participating in the Communion. On these occasions prayers for the dead were offered, probably before the end of the second century.

From the time of Ignatius, some of the Fathers,

among them Justin Martyr and Irenæus, ascribed to the Lord's Supper an efficacious influence on the body and spirit of the recipient. Justin Martyr says: "For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."

Christ was believed to enter into mysterious union with the bread and wine, though these elements did not lose their native properties. It was not a doctrine of transubstantiation, which the Fathers held, and which is familiar to later theology; this doctrine was first advocated by Radbertus in 831 A. D., and not until 1215 was it given ecclesiastical sanction by Pope Innocent III.

The idea of the Lord's Supper as the repetition of the veritable expiatory sacrifice of Christ is suggested by Tertullian in the words: "When the Lord's Body has been received and reserved (apparently for eating at home), each point is secured, both the participation of the sacrifice and the discharge of duty."

A little later than Tertullian, Cyprian speaks of the sacrament in such a way as to show that he conceives it as a repetition by Christian priests of

the offering and sacrifice of Christ on the cross; but this view was not general, nor was it insisted upon by Cyprian.

The view of Cyprian was confined to the Western churches. "In the East," says Harnack, "we possess no proof that before the time of Eusebius there is any idea of the offering of the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper."

We have now considered the development of the Church as an organization from the days of the apostles to the end of the third century. We have seen that this organization was in large part determined by the state of society and the spirit of the age. It was the product of tendencies inherent in those who composed the membership of the Church and of the influences which were exerted upon them by their environment. The analogy between the Church and the political organization of the Roman empire is undoubtedly real and close; "but it would be a mistake," says Ramsay, "to attribute it to conscious imitation, or even to seek in Roman institutions the origin of church institutions that resemble them."

In our study we have observed the change from the free and fluent life of the primitive Christian societies to the more or less artificial and constrained life of the highly elaborated ecclesiasticism which is exhibited to us under the administration of Cyprian, — the change from pure congregationalism to the episcopacy which

in the persons and rule of some of the great bishops already adumbrated the hierarchy of Hildebrand. We have observed the transition from the simple faith in Christ, which characterized the first disciples, to the beginnings, at least, of the detailed and dogmatic creeds which were rapidly wrought out in the fourth century. We have seen baptism transformed from a symbolical acknowledgment of discipleship to Christ into a mystical and saving sacrament; and the Lord's Supper, from a joyful memorial of the recently departed Lord into a re-enactment of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. We have seen the Lord's day transformed from the natural occasion for a glad and spontaneous remembrance of Christ's resurrection into a Christian Sabbath, that was beginning to take on the religious character of its Jewish prototype. This process of change and development was, in important particulars, a retrogression rather than an advance; and in all subsequent centuries there have not been wanting protests, like Montanism in the second century, and the Reformation in the sixteenth, and the powerful movement toward ecclesiastical and theological liberty of our own day.

Yet there was a real advance, which the fascination of the primitive church-life, with its simplicity and spontaneity and enthusiasm must not be allowed to obscure. As we study the Church of the first three centuries, certain things grow clear: *First*, that Christianity came into the world,

not as an institution, but as a *life*, with force to create any and every institution for its needs. That fact enables us to discriminate between the ecclesiastical form which, at any time, particular influences or particular exigencies have shaped, and the truth and spirit which underlie all forms. It also enables us to appreciate the pure democracy of Congregationalism, the representative democracy of Presbyterianism, and the oligarchical ecclesiasticism of Episcopacy. All types exist germinally in the apostolic Church, and each type has its justification in the mission and needs, as well as its illustration in the history of the Church. No one of them can maintain itself to the absolute exclusion of the others.

It grows clear: *Second*, that in the broad, elemental Christian idea, there is room in the one Catholic Church for all varieties, both of needed or useful organization and of sincere thought and worship. Christianity is more than its instruments, and larger than even its symbols. It is hospitable to whatever is real and good in the ideas and endeavors of men. The Church, in its true manifoldness, is inclusive and not exclusive. There is place in it for the intense devotion of Ignatius, the stern asceticism of Tatian, the catholic intellectuality of the Alexandrine Clemens, the mystical Puritanism of Montanus, the theological boldness and massiveness of Origen, and the imperious ecclesiasticism of Cyprian. There is room for the

individualist and the socialist, the Churchman and the Quaker, the Trinitarian and the Unitarian, the saint and the sceptic, — yes, and even the reverent agnostic. The unity of life, of spiritual aspiration and endeavor, of pure desire and holy love, is deeper and stronger than any uniformity, and wider in its scope than all diversities of creed or organization. Each sect or party that has arisen in the Church has emphasized some important phase of truth, has met some need of human life, and has made some contribution to the spiritual and social progress of the race. And back of all is the universal Christ, the creator of no specific institution, but the inspirer of all enterprises that have worked for the emancipation and enlightenment of man.

It may justly be said that the state of the primitive Church was not an ideal state. It certainly is true that the state of the Church in the times of Gregory VII. and Leo X. was still less an ideal state. But in the first three centuries the careful student of history will find the germs and beginnings of whatever form or doctrine or ecclesiastical order has proved itself to be good and promotive of man's religious and moral well-being; and he will find the prophetic intimations of the future Catholic Church in which the spirit of Christ will fitly and fully manifest itself for the salvation both of the individual soul and of the world. What the form of that coming Church

will be, the modest student will hesitate to affirm; but he will still confidently believe that without the abandonment of organic life, or the loss of anything valuable which it has won through the centuries of its history, that Church will illustrate the fullest development of the individual liberty and spontaneity of the first Christian years, combined with the comprehensiveness and efficiency of the most perfect organization which the wisdom of all the centuries of experience can produce.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

THE term "Apostolic Fathers" properly designates only men in the primitive Church who had personal contact with one or more of the apostles, and have left some written record of the Christian thought and life of their time. Of such men there have survived in history the names of but five or six. It is not strange that there should be so few, for the earliest growth of Christianity was not among people who had the training or capacity to make any literary contribution to the expression or defence of the Christian faith. After the middle of the second century there is no lack of great names. The second, third, fourth and fifth centuries were distinguished by the labors of powerful apologists, profound theologians, and able administrators.

It is well for us to be reminded, again and again, that Christianity began without schools, without learning and culture, and without any of the advantages of wealth and rank. Among the original apostles there were only three or four who were in any sense men of mark, at least in point of intellect. Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, James

and John, have an eminent place in the events recorded in the Book of Acts. Matthew survives in the memory of men solely because of the connection of his name with the first Gospel. St. Paul, not one of the twelve, was a man of colossal genius. The impression of his powerful personality and his thought has been felt by the Christian Church through all its history more profoundly than that of any other save Jesus Himself.

From the time of St. Paul's death until near the middle of the second century the student works in an obscure time. The history of the Church during those years runs underground. "We read it," says Plummer, "as we read the geological history of this planet, rather in its effects than in its operations."

One cannot help being impressed by the illustration which the early Church furnishes of the independence of the Christian faith of those means which are usually necessary to success in any propaganda. After Paul passed away the only great survivor was the apostle John, and his labors were confined mainly to Asia Minor and the vicinity of Ephesus. It might truly be said of those days that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble" were called, and surely the strong things of the world were overcome by the weak. He who believes in the Christian faith as the result of a divine communication and impulse, will have no difficulty in accounting for the

spread and ultimate triumph of that faith; but he who depends for the solution of the problem only upon what are called "natural causes," has upon his hands a problem most difficult of solution.

During that "underground" period there were undoubtedly many devoted and energetic and even capable followers of Christ; but there were only a very few who have left any traces of themselves in Christian literature. The material for our study consists mainly of a few somewhat heterogeneous literary remains and considerable uncertain tradition. By a careful and patient study of these, scholars have arrived at a tolerably clear, though very limited, knowledge of the growth and tendencies of the Church during the first hundred years after its beginning; but in the traditions of that early time there is undoubtedly very much fiction. As Harnack has pithily said, "Hier gäbe es reichen Stoff um ohne Geschichte Geschichte zu machen."

Fortunately there have been recent and valuable additions to our knowledge of the sub-apostolic period. The most notable of these additions is the "Didache," or the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," a copy of which was discovered and given to the world a few years ago.

Our present study of the Apostolic Fathers will include sketches of Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Papias, Ignatius, and Polycarp, and some account of their literary remains. Of these names

only the first and the last two represent personalities that have any distinctness as historical figures. Assuming that Barnabas and Hermas are names of real persons, we may claim the slight acquaintance that is afforded by their writings. Both wrote Greek, and there survives from one of them a letter known as the "Epistle of Barnabas," and from the other an allegorical romance known as the "Shepherd of Hermas." Our study will also include some account of the "Didache," and some other writings which tradition has erroneously attributed to Clement of Rome.

Clement of Rome.

Clement of Rome is thought, on account of his name, to have been a pagan. His great familiarity with the Old Testament, showing a long acquaintance with it, would indicate that he was a Hellenistic Jew; but we have no means of determining this question, nor is it specially important. He was a resident of Rome and a prominent member of the Roman church during the latter part of the first century. Some writers have identified him with the Clement mentioned by St. Paul in his epistle to the Philippians. While this is not impossible, it is on the whole improbable. Others deny that he was the Clement mentioned in Philippians, but grant that he was a companion or acquaintance of St. Paul and St. Peter in Rome. Irenæus speaks of him as being

acquainted with the apostles, and there is a tradition that he was converted to the Christian faith by St. Paul. Lightfoot says that "the tradition that he was a disciple of one or both of these apostles is early, constant, and definite; and it is borne out by the character and contents of his genuine epistle."

There is some evidence that he was a bishop, or presbyter, of the Roman church in the last decade of the first century, probably in conjunction with Linus and Anencletus. Eusebius gives the date of his official service as from 93 to 101 A. D. His name, in company with the names of Linus and Cletus, appears in the liturgy of the Roman church as early as the second century. With some plausibility Clement has been identified with Flavius Clemens, a relative of the emperor Domitian, who was put to death by the emperor on the charge of atheism near the end of his reign, and whose wife, Domitilla, also a relative of the emperor, was banished. There is no doubt that the charge designates Flavius Clemens as a Christian, and that he was one of the victims of the persecution which marked the close of Domitian's reign. There are, however, very great difficulties in the way of accepting this identification of our Clement with the martyr-consul. Nothing whatever is known of the time or manner of his death, though there are late and untrustworthy traditions that he died a martyr.

Considerable literature is attached to the name of Clement. The only genuine writing of his that has survived is an epistle to the church in Corinth. This letter, which is purely irenical, is not written in the name of Clement, but in the name of the church in Rome. Its single aim was to restore harmony in a church that, as we know from the epistles of St. Paul, was early distinguished by the spirit of dissension. It seems that the church, or a part of it, had revolted against some of its presbyters and had turned them out of office. The letter is not that of a brilliant or strong mind, but rather that of a gentle nature, characterized by simple faith and cheerful piety. Only once or twice in the whole letter does the style rise above the commonplace. I quote the best example: "How blessed and wonderful, beloved, are the gifts of God! Life in immortality, splendor in righteousness, truth in boldness, faith in assurance, self-control in holiness! And all these fall under the cognizance of our understandings [now]; what then shall those things be which are prepared for such as wait for Him? The Creator and Father of all worlds, the Most Holy, alone knows their amount and their beauty."

The epistle abounds in quotations from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, in which, sometimes, are incorporated phrases that do not belong to the sacred text. It also contains many quotations from the New Testament. Of the

twenty-seven books of the latter, the author quotes from fourteen. These quotations are most abundant from Hebrews and First Corinthians. There are no quotations from the Fourth Gospel, nor from the epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians, and to Timothy and Philemon, nor from the epistles of St. John and St. Jude. The writer alludes to the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. Of the latter he says: "By reason of jealousy and strife, Paul, by his example, pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness unto the whole world and having reached the farthest bounds of the West; and when he had borne his testimony before the rulers, so he departed from the world and went unto the holy place, having been found a notable pattern of patient endurance."

Many consider that there is in this passage a distinct intimation that St. Paul preached the gospel in Spain, and, possibly, even in Britain. The statement that the apostle was "seven times in bonds" is fully sustained by his own declaration in his second letter to the Corinthians that he had been "in prisons more abundantly" than the other apostles.

The first part of Clement's letter is taken up

with the citation of examples of Christian virtue in the saints, in various Old Testament characters, and in Christ, and with exhortations to humility and peaceableness. In the latter part the writer gently but plainly charges the Corinthians with their factiousness and disorder, and urges the opposing factions to mutual conciliation and the pursuit of peace.

The letter incidentally throws light on the organization of the early Church. It shows that the episcopate of half a century later was not yet enucleated in the Roman church. It uses the terms "presbyter" and "bishop" in the same sense, and recognizes only two offices, that of presbyter, or bishop, and that of deacon. It also reveals the democratic character of the Church in its reference to the appointment of presbyters "with the consent of the whole church." It thus exhorts the members of the church who were active in the contention: "Who therefore is noble among you? Who is compassionate? Who is fulfilled with love? Let him say: If by reason of me there be faction and strife and divisions, I retire, I depart, whither ye will, and I do that which is ordered by the people; only let the flock of Christ be at peace with its duly appointed presbyters."

In section fifty-five there is an interesting reference to the fact that in times of persecution many Christians, urged by the zeal of love, achieved the most complete self-sacrifice on behalf of their

brethren. "We know," says Clement, "that many among ourselves have delivered themselves to bondage that they might ransom others. Many have sold themselves to slavery, and receiving the price paid for themselves, have fed others."

As an indication of Clement's simplicity of mind, we observe that he takes the fabled Phœnix quite seriously, and uses it as an illustration of the Resurrection. He also finds in the red cord which the spies used to mark Rahab's house in Jericho, a prophetic sign of the blood of Christ by which believers are redeemed from sin. The epistle is marked throughout by a purity of moral tone that separates it by an almost immeasurable degree from contemporary pagan writings. The latter half of section fifty-nine and the whole of sections sixty and sixty-one are taken up with a prayer, which is so carefully elaborated as to suggest that it is a prayer which Clement was in the habit of using in public worship; perhaps it was a part of the nascent liturgy of the Roman Church.

It is interesting to note that Clement's letter contains no allusion which gives support to the theory that the post-apostolic Church was divided between Pauline and anti-Pauline schools of thought. It was so highly valued by the early Christians that it was read in the churches on Sunday as if it were Scripture. Clement of Alexandria frequently quotes it as the work of the "Apostle Clemens."

The following works have been ascribed by tra-

dition to Clement, but it is impossible that any of them save the first should have been his work, and the evidence against the authenticity of the first is practically conclusive.

1. THE SECOND EPISTLE OF CLEMENT TO THE CORINTHIANS. This writing is not a letter, but rather a homily, or sermon, which belongs somewhere in the first half of the second century, quite certainly before 140 A. D., and there is no insuperable objection to its being dated as early as 120. It is, therefore, probably the earliest extant Christian sermon outside of the New Testament. The writer is unknown. His work is characterized by a lofty moral tone and strong faith, but by no striking merits of thought or style. It alludes to presbyters, but to no other officers of the Church. The opening sentence pretty clearly indicates the early Christian belief in the divinity of Christ. It is as follows: "Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ as of God, as of the Judge of quick and dead." The author reports sayings of Jesus which are not found in the New Testament; for example, there is the following conversation between the Lord and Peter: "For the Lord saith, 'Ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves.' But Peter answered and said unto Him, 'What then, if the wolves should tear the lambs?' Jesus said unto Peter, 'Let not the lambs fear the wolves after they are dead; and ye also, fear ye not them that

kill you and are not able to do anything to you; but fear Him that after ye are dead hath power over soul and body, to cast them into the gehenna of fire!'" In another place, speaking of the coming of the kingdom of God, he says: "Let us therefore await the kingdom of God betimes in love and righteousness, since we know not the day of God's appearing. For the Lord Himself, being asked by a certain person when His kingdom would come, said, 'When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female.'" To this passage, which is quoted from the Apocryphal Gospel of the Egyptians, he gives an ingenious explanation. The same passage is quoted by Clement of Alexandria in his "Stromateis."

The idea of baptism as a seal which must be kept pure and undefiled finds place in this homily. There is an allusion to the Resurrection which indicates that the writer believed in the actual resuscitation of the body: "We ought therefore to guard the flesh as a temple of God: for in like manner as ye are called in the flesh, ye shall come also in the flesh."

2. Two Epistles on Virginity. These were discovered in 1750 by Wetstein, and are known only in the Syriac tongue. It is evident, however, that they have been translated from the Greek, for they contain Grecisms, and there is a fragment of what

is evidently another Syriac version. These epistles cannot possibly be the work of Clement; they belong to a much later time, though their authenticity was strenuously argued by Wetstein, and even Neander was inclined to admit their authenticity. The author quotes from the Fourth Gospel, and also from the Apocrypha, and gives evidence of a long familiarity with the writings of the New Testament, like that which Clement shows with the writings of the Old. The teaching of these epistles is strongly ascetical. Some critics put them as early as 150 A. D., but, as there is no notice of them in Eusebius, it is probable, both that they were not widely known in the early Church, and that they were written later than the middle of the second century.

3. THE CLEMENTINES. The study of *The Clementines* properly belongs under the head of the heresies of the Church, but since they have been ascribed to Clement of Rome I shall give some account of them here.

This remarkable work, or cluster of works, consists of (1) "The Homilies" and (2) "The Recognitions." There is also a third form known as "The Epitome," which is a late abridgment of "The Homilies" with some additions, especially the continuation of the story, and an account of the martyrdom of Clement. There seem to have been several forms of "The Epitome," but it does not differ so

essentially from the "Homilies" and the "Recognitions" as to require separate treatment. Both the "Homilies" and the "Recognitions" were written in Greek, but of the latter the Greek has been lost, and we possess it only in the form of a Latin translation by Rufinus.

Nothing conclusive is known concerning the author of the "Clementines." Some have believed that it is the genuine work of Clement; others have ascribed it to some of Clement's hearers and companions; and still others have attributed it to Bardesanes, or Bardaisan, a Syrian theologian and Gnostic, who was born at Edessa in 154 A. D. The book was written, probably, in Oriental Syria, and belongs to the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, but contains matter of an earlier date. The work is fiction charged with Ebionitic doctrine of the Elchasaite type. It assumes to represent the condition of the Church between the Ascension and the beginning of the labors of St. Paul. Peter is the hero and Simon Magus is the villain. I will sketch briefly the story as it appears in the "Recognitions."

The "Recognitions" is composed of ten books and is in the form of an autobiography addressed by Clement to James, bishop of Jerusalem. It falls naturally into three parts: (1) Books I–III.; (2) IV–VI.; (3) VII–X.; which Dr. Salmon suggests are probably of different dates. The first part begins with Clement's early history. It tells us that

he was born in Rome, and from the earliest age was a lover of chastity. His mind, naturally inclined to speculation, was beset by grave doubts and perplexities as to the origin and destiny of things and the immortality of the soul. The account of the great distress which he suffered, and from which he found no alleviation in the schools of the philosophers, is pathetic and even eloquent. Clement determines to test the question of the immortality of the soul by going to Egypt and instituting an inquiry of the Egyptian hierophants and magicians. He is restrained however from executing his purpose. Then he hears of the remarkable teachings and miraculous deeds of Christ. There is here, evidently, an anachronism, for, in what Clement reports of Christ it would seem as if Christ were still alive, whereas the entire action of the story is confined to the few years immediately after the Ascension. While Clement is brooding upon what he hears of Christ, Barnabas comes to Rome and preaches the gospel. He is opposed and derided by the multitude, but Clement takes his part against the scoffers, and carries him off to his house. Barnabas soon departs for Judea, in order to be present at a Jewish feast, but he has so impressed Clement that the latter resolves to follow him. After a little time Clement goes to Cæsarea, where he meets Peter, and finds that the apostle is to have, on the following day, a public discussion with one Simon, a Samaritan. Clement is cordially

received by Peter, to whom he gives an account of himself. Peter instructs him, showing the causes of ignorance of the truth, speaks to him of the true Prophet, by which name he designates Christ, and invites Clement to be his attendant. Clement profits much by Peter's instruction and expresses his appreciation and gratitude to the great satisfaction of the apostle.

The proposed discussion does not come off immediately, for Simon desires to postpone it for seven days. Peter consents to the postponement, telling Clement that it will be advantageous because in the mean time he can more fully explain to him the true doctrine. Peter continues his instruction, covering the history and teachings of the Hebrew Scriptures, and detailing, from his point of view, the events which had occurred from the coming of Christ down to the time when Simon challenges him to debate, including in his discourse a notice of the persecution of the disciples by Saul. When the day comes for the discussion with Simon, Peter rouses his attendants early in the morning and discourses to them, at length, upon Simon Magus, setting forth his history, his formidable powers and his extreme wickedness. At the appointed hour the disputation begins; it covers a wide field of discussion and continues through several days. Simon is finally overcome with dismay by Peter's evident knowledge of the secret source of his power.

This is betrayed in the following manner: Simon asks to hear in a single sentence how the soul is immortal. Peter replies, "If you do not know, go now to your house, and entering the inner bed-chamber you will see an image placed, containing the figure of a murdered boy clothed in purple; ask him, and he will inform you either by hearing or seeing. For what need is there to hear from him if the soul is immortal, when you see it standing before you?" Peter proposes to go at once to Simon's house. Simon, hearing this, is stricken in conscience, and turns pale with fright. He beseeches Peter to receive him to repentance, but, a little later, finding that Peter had learned of his secret from some persons who had been his associates, he is filled with rage, and turns fiercely on Peter, and denounces him as "most wicked and deceitful;" at the same time he boasts of his divine nature and power:—

"I am the first power, who am always, and without beginning. But having entered the womb of Rachel, I was born of her as a man, that I might be visible to men. I have flown through the air; I have been mixed with fire, and been made one body with it; I have made statues to move; I have animated lifeless things; I have made stones bread; I have flown from mountain to mountain; I have moved from place to place, upheld by angels' hands, and have lighted on the earth. Not only have I done these things, but even now I am able to do them, that by facts I may prove to all that I am the Son of God, enduring to eternity, and that I can make those

who believe on me endure in like manner forever. But your words are all vain; nor can you perform any real works, since he also who sent you is a magician, who yet could not deliver himself from the suffering of the Cross."

After seeking in vain to stir up a riot, Simon is driven out with a single follower, and Peter discourses for a little time on Simon's lamentable delusion, and then dismisses the people with a benediction.

During the following night the apostle engages in a long conversation with his companions, in which one Niceta takes part as interlocutor. Later, a deserter from Simon reports that the magician has gone to Rome, and Peter resolves to follow him. He first appoints Zaccheus bishop of Cæsarea, and ordains presbyters and deacons. He then sends twelve disciples before him, and, after baptizing more than ten thousand believers, hearing that Simon had gone to Tripolis, he departs for the latter city. Here ends the first part.

The second part continues the narrative. On arriving at Tripolis, Peter finds that Simon has departed on the way to Syria. The apostle is met by crowds of people in Tripolis, among whom he performs miracles of healing on many demoniacs and other sick, and to whom he preaches on demons and idolatry and false prophets. Clement, being not yet baptized, is not permitted to join with the disciples even in prayer. Peter continued dis-

coursing unweariedly throughout the two following days, and on the third sent certain of his disciples on to Antioch. He, however, remained three months in Tripolis, where he baptized many believers, appointed a bishop, ordained presbyters and deacons, and arranged the service of the church. Clement remained with him, and at this time, apparently, received baptism.

The third part, consisting of the remaining books, the seventh to the tenth, contains the long and highly romantic story of Clement's family, in the course of which Peter brings together long separated relatives, and converts them all to the gospel, and, finally, not without the use of pious fraud, accomplishes the complete discomfiture of Simon. Such very briefly is the story of the "Recognitions."

The "Homilies" is the same story with variations. Both the "Homilies" and the "Recognitions" seem to be modifications of a previously existing story. It is probable that the "Homilies" is, in the main, the earlier of the two. In it the Ebionitic and Gnostic elements appear in about equal proportions. "The 'Homilies,' says Dr. Donaldson, "contain all the characteristics of Ebionism in much the harsher form." The idea of the unity of God which the book presents is emphasized with Jewish force, but it is wanting in the high spirituality of the best Jewish thought; it is also in some sense dualistic, while a marked dualism appears in the view of the world which is set forth. Jesus is represented, not

as the atoning Saviour of men, but as the ideal Prophet who saves by enlightening. The freedom of the will is affirmed, somewhat illogically, it must be confessed, in view of the dualism which pervades the book. Great liberty is used in the treatment of the Old Testament. Peter is represented as saying that some scriptures are true, and some are false; and whatever does not agree with his own views he promptly rejects as spurious interpolation. Adam and the Patriarchs are idealized, and Christianity is essentially identified with Judaism; though sacrifices are cast aside and circumcision is not inculcated. The ecclesiastical point of view is hierarchical. "Great importance is attached to baptism and the episcopacy; but James, rather than Peter, is represented as the head of the hierarchy, the highest authority in the church." "Remember," says Peter, "to shun the apostle or teacher or prophet who does not first carefully compare his preaching with [that of] James, who was called the brother of my Lord, and to whom was intrusted to administer the church of the Hebrews in Jerusalem."

The "Recognitions" was probably later than the "Homilies," since it shows a less wide departure from the Catholic doctrine, evidently having been subjected to considerable modification.

The main interest of this variform work lies in its supposed revelation of the great doctrinal conflict in the early Church, and its expression of

an anti-Pauline spirit. Baur and the Tübingen school supposed that in Simon the magician the writer has attacked St. Paul. Chapter xix. of the seventeenth homily is very clearly an assault upon the Apostle to the Gentiles. I give in conclusion the following condensed account by Dr. Salmon of the doctrinal character of this singular work. He says: —

"The Clementines are unmistakably the production of that sect of Ebionites which held the book of *Elchasai* as sacred. . . . Almost all the doctrines ascribed to them are to be found in the Clementines. We have the doctrine . . . of successive incarnations of Christ, and, in particular, the identification of Christ with Adam; the requirement of the obligations of the Mosaic Law, the rejection, however, of the rite of sacrifice; the rejection of certain passages both of the Old and New Testaments; hostility to the apostle Paul; abstinence from the use of flesh; the inculcation of repeated washing; discouragement of virginity; concealment of their sacred books from all but approved persons; form of adjuration by appeal to the seven witnesses; ascription of gigantic stature to the angels; and permission to dissemble the faith in time of persecution."

3. The Apostolic Constitutions. This work which, like the preceding, was erroneously ascribed to Clement of Rome, consists, in its present form, of eight books, containing in more or less diffuse and hortatory form, precepts bearing on theology, ecclesiastical order, and Chris-

tian morals. Apostolic authority has often been claimed for this work, and the work itself begins in a form agreeable to this claim: "The apostles and elders to all those who from among the Gentiles have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ: grace and peace from Almighty God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied unto you in the acknowledgment of Him." The first six books were probably the earliest known and are frequently referred to and quoted as "The Teaching of the Apostles" (Τὰ διδασκαλία Τῶν 'Αποστόλων), of which they are probably an expansion belonging to the third century. It has been remarked that the seventh book, which was known separately, in some parts bears "a curious resemblance to the Epistle of Barnabas." It is undoubtedly based on the "Didache." The eighth book was also an independent work, and is somewhat more legislative than any of the preceding. Notwithstanding that the "Constitutions" profess to be the work of the apostles, there is no clear reference to them before Eusebius. He rejects them as "spurious," and speaks of them as "so-called teachings of the apostles." Athanasius speaks of them in a similar manner. Both of these references, however, are a little uncertain, but in the fifth century an unknown writer distinctly refers to the eighth book.

The "Constitutions" were well known in the sixth and seventh centuries. It is impossible that they should have been the work of the apostles, or even

of apostolic men; nevertheless, their apostolicity has been at different times vigorously defended. Whiston, an eccentric scholar, devoted a volume to proving that the Apostolic Constitutions (in his own words) "are the most sacred of the canonical books of the New Testament;" for, he adds, "these sacred Christian laws or constitutions were delivered at Jerusalem, and in Mount Sion, by our Saviour to the eleven apostles there assembled after His Resurrection." In their present form they probably belong to the fifth century, but most of the materials of which they are composed antedate the Council of Nice. Bunsen held that, with the exception of a few passages, they belonged to the ante-Nicene period, and that they were of Oriental origin. They were never received as authority in the Church, though they exercised great influence, especially in the Eastern Church.

The "Constitutions" deal with the private behavior proper for Christians, with the officers and service of the church, and with worship, and they contain considerable liturgical matter. Much space is given to the sacraments and the duties and powers of the clergy. The second book, which treats of the clergy, is much the longest of the first six, and, if we except the Apostolic Canons at the end of the eighth book, much the longest of the entire work.

The "Apostolic Canons" consist of eighty-five rules for the guidance of the clergy, attached to the

eighth book of the "Constitutions." These rules, most of which had been in existence for a long time, were collected about the beginning of the fifth century. The eighty-fifth rule fixes the canon of the New Testament, but includes, in addition to the writings which are now considered canonical, two epistles of Clement and the eight books of the "Constitutions."

Barnabas.

The notices in the New Testament of Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul, are familiar. His name appears among the Apostolic Fathers because of a writing, which very generally has been ascribed to him, known as the "Epistle of Barnabas." The tone of this writing is violently anti-Judaistic. It emphasizes strongly the spirituality of worship; denies anything preparatory or disciplinary in Judaism, in the sense of training men for higher truths, yet admits that in Jewish history and economy there are, to the spiritual perception, foreshadowings of a Christian revelation. The writer maintains that God's covenant never belonged to the Jews, but to Christians. He vigorously affirms the entire abolition of the Jewish sacrifices, condemns the Jewish fasts as not true fasts, and claims that God has given to Christians the Testament that Moses broke. The new covenant, founded on the sufferings of Christ, tends to the salvation of Christians, but to the destruction of Jews.

These, — the sufferings of Christ and the covenant founded upon them, — the writer declares, are announced by the prophets; and he discovers types of Christ and prefigurations of Baptism and the Cross in the Old Testament sacrifices and symbols. He shows the spiritual significance of circumcision and of the Mosaic precepts on different kinds of food. He claims that the true Sabbath was no longer the seventh day but the eighth, and represents God as saying, "I will make the beginning of the eighth day which is the beginning of another world;" and he adds, "Wherefore also we keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in the which also Jesus rose from the dead, and, having been manifested, ascended into the Heavens." The epistle closes with an exposition of the Two Ways: the Way of Light, and the Way of Darkness.

The epistle of Barnabas was received in the early Church with great reverence, and by many it was esteemed as Scripture, in the supposition that its author was the companion of St. Paul. Clement of Alexandria, where the epistle was written and where it was earliest received, quotes it frequently, identifying the author with the Barnabas of the Acts, and calling him, sometimes the "Apostle," and sometimes the "Prophet," Barnabas. Origen also held this view. At the present time scholars are about equally divided on the question of authorship.

The date of the epistle has been a matter of

considerable dispute. From a reference in the epistle itself, it must have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem. It was probably written during the reign of Vespasian between 70 and 79 A. D.

The Didache.

The manuscript of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" was discovered by Philotheos Bryennios, metropolitan of Nicomedia, in the Jerusalem Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre in Constantinople, in 1873. Besides the "Didache," the manuscript contained: (1) "A synopsis of the Old and New Testaments in the Order of Books," by St. Chrysostom, (2) "The Epistle of Barnabas," (3) "The First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians," (4) "The Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians," (5) the spurious "Epistle of Mary of Cassoboli," and (6) twelve pseudo-Ignatian epistles. None of these, save the "Didache," were new, but the copies of the two epistles ascribed to Clement are the only complete copies known to be in existence.

The Greek text of the "Didache" was published by Bryennios, with notes and prolegomena written in Greek, at the close of 1883, in Constantinople. The importance of this document was soon recognized, and all over Christendom it received the critical attention of scholars. The name, "Didache," is simply the Greek word which means "Teach-

ing." The full title is "The Teaching of the Lord to the Gentiles by the Twelve Apostles." The phrase, "to the Gentiles," indicates the Jewish-Christian origin of the document. This writing is variously dated by scholars, — by Sabatier, as early as about 50 A. D.; by Hilgenfeld, as late as 160–190; by Harnack, Zahn, Lightfoot, Bestmann, and others, at intervening dates. There is nothing in the "Didache" to prevent us from ascribing it to a date as early as 70 A. D., and the whole character of the writing favors the view that it was produced before the close of the first century, or very early in the second.

The "Didache" is the oldest manual of apostolic teaching and discipline that we have. It consists of sixteen brief chapters which naturally fall into two divisions. The first, consisting of the first six chapters, is doctrinal and catechetical, and sets forth two Ways: the Way of Life, and the Way of Death. It begins thus: —

"There are two Ways, one of Life and one of Death; but there is a great difference between the two Ways. Now the Way of Life is this: first, thou shalt love God who made thee; second, thy neighbor as thyself; and all things whatsoever thou wouldst not have done to thee, neither do thou to another."

The second part, consisting of the remaining ten chapters, gives directions concerning baptism, prayer, fasting, the eucharist, the love-feast, and

the treatment of apostles, prophets, bishops, and deacons, and closes with a solemn warning to watchfulness in view of the second coming of the Lord: —

"Be watchful for your life; let your lamps not be quenched and your loins not ungirded, but be ye ready; for ye know not the hour in which our Lord cometh. And ye shall gather yourselves together frequently, seeking what is fitting for your souls; for the whole time of your faith shall not profit you, if ye be not perfected at the last season. For in the last days the false prophets and corrupters shall be multiplied, and the sheep shall be turned into wolves, and love shall be turned into hate. For as lawlessness increaseth, they shall hate one another and shall persecute and betray. And then the world-deceiver shall appear as a son of God; and shall work signs and wonders, and the earth shall be delivered into his hands; and he shall do unholy things, which have never been since the world began. Then all created mankind shall come to the fire of testing, and many shall be offended and perish; but they that endure in their faith shall be saved by the Curse Himself," etc.

I follow the rendering by Lightfoot. The clause rendered, "shall be saved by the Curse Himself," has occasioned considerable perplexity, but this rendering is approved by Bryennios, and Christ is called "The Curse" probably in allusion to 1 Cor. xii. 3: "No man speaking in the spirit of God saith Jesus is accursed," and in allusion to the custom of both Jewish and heathen persecutors,

who endeavored to compel Christians to curse Christ.

The "Didache" quotes several passages from the Old Testament, and clearly alludes to a large number; it quotes also from several books of the Apocrypha. From the New Testament the quotations are abundant, but they are almost entirely from the Gospel by St. Matthew. There are manifest allusions to the Acts, to five or six of St. Paul's epistles, to Hebrews, to First Peter, and to Revelation. There are also various phrases which seem to indicate, on the part of the writer, a knowledge of the Fourth Gospel, though there are no distinct quotations from it.

The theology of the "Didache" is simple and elementary. God is represented as the Creator, the Almighty Ruler, the heavenly Father, the perfect Providence, the Giver of all good gifts, the Author of salvation, and the object of worship. Christ is represented as Lord and Saviour, the servant and son of God, the author of the gospel, through whom knowledge and eternal life have been made known; and, apparently, He is identified with the Jehovah of the Old Testament.

The concluding thanksgiving prescribed for use in the celebration of the Eucharist is as follows: —

"We give Thee thanks, Holy Father, for Thy holy name, which Thou hast made to tabernacle in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which

Thou hast made known unto us through Thy Son Jesus; Thine is the glory for ever and ever. Thou, Almighty Master, didst create all things for Thy name's sake, and didst give food and drink unto men for enjoyment, that they might render thanks to Thee; but didst bestow upon us spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy Son. Before all things we give Thee thanks that Thou art powerful; Thine is the glory for ever and ever. Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from all evil and to perfect it in Thy love; and gather it together from the four winds — even the Church which has been sanctified — into Thy kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory for ever and ever. May grace come and may this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any man is holy, let him come; if any man is not, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen."

Sunday is designated as "the Lord's own day," and the proper observance of it is thus indicated: "On the Lord's own day gather yourselves together and break bread and give thanks, first confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure." The fourth and sixth days, that is, Wednesday and Friday, are designated as fast-days, and fasting is prescribed also before baptism. There is no allusion to the celebration of the Christian Passover, nor to the idea of Christ's death as an expiatory sacrifice.

Of church officers only two are recognized, — bishops, or overseers, and deacons; but mention

is made also of "apostles and prophets," who were evidently travelling teachers and evangelists.

"Let every apostle, when he cometh to you, be received as the Lord; but he shall not abide more than a single day, or if there be need, a second likewise; but if he abide three days, he is a false prophet. And when he departeth let the apostle receive nothing save bread, until he findeth shelter; but if he ask money he is a false prophet. . . . And every prophet teaching the truth, if he doeth not what he teacheth, is a false prophet. . . . And whosoever shall say in the Spirit, Give me silver or anything else, ye shall not listen to him; but if he tell you to give on behalf of others that are in want, let no man judge him."

The apostles and the prophets seem to be different functionaries, yet they are not sharply discriminated from each other. The "Didache" continues: —

"Let every one that cometh in the name of the Lord be received; and then when ye have tested him ye shall know him, for ye shall have understanding on the right hand and on the left. If the comer is a traveller, assist him, so far as ye are able; but he shall not stay with you more than two or three days, if it be necessary. But if he wishes to settle with you, being a craftsman, let him work for and eat his bread. But if he has no craft, according to your wisdom provide how he shall live as a Christian among you, but not in idleness. If he will not do this, he is trafficking upon Christ. Beware of such men.

"But every true prophet desiring to settle among you is

worthy of his food. In like manner a true teacher is also worthy, like the workman, of his food."

The functions of the church officers, as indicated in the "Didache," seem to include also prophesying and teaching. Those to whom the writing is addressed are thus enjoined: "Appoint for yourselves, therefore, bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men who are meek and not lovers of money, and true and approved; for unto you they also perform the service of the prophets and teachers. Therefore despise them not; for they are your honorable men along with the prophets and teachers." This instruction concerning the appointment of bishops and deacons, clearly indicates the very early date of the "Didache."

Hermas.

Hermas is the reputed author of "a curious and somewhat visionary book" called the "Shepherd," or "Pastor," which belongs probably to the closing years of the first century. It is both mentioned and quoted by writers in the latter half of the second century. The book is artless in style, and is marked by deep and earnest piety. Lightfoot likens the "Shepherd" to the "Divina Commedia," in the one respect that the author's own personal and family history is interwoven with the narrative, and made to subserve the moral purpose of the book; though "history plays a much less

important part here than in Dante's great poem." There is also a slight resemblance to Beatrice in the character of Rhoda.

The centre of the geographical setting is Rome, where, undoubtedly, the work was written. Localities mentioned are the home of Hermas in the city, the road to Cumæ, the Via Campana, and, in the ninth *similitude*, Arcadia. The last may have been the birthplace of Hermas.

Though I have assigned the "Shepherd" to the last years of the first century, it must be said that the date of its composition is not certain. We know, however, that soon after the middle of the second century the work was in general circulation in both the Eastern and Western churches. It appears, also, that a Latin version of it was made about this time. Irenæus of Gaul quotes from it with these words: "Well said the Scripture," — a fact which is noticed by Eusebius. It is fair to infer that, in the time of Irenæus, the "Shepherd" was publicly read in the Gallican churches. Tertullian in Africa, and Clement and Origen in Alexandria, all quote from it. By some of the Fathers the book was put on a level with inspired Scripture. Origen speaks of it as "very useful scripture, in my opinion divinely inspired." After Tertullian became a Montanist (about 200) he repudiated the "Shepherd" as too sensuous for his Puritan taste.

The author of the Muratorian Canon allows the

"Shepherd" to be read privately, but denies it any place among the writings either of prophets or apostles. It was very popular, however, and was publicly read as Scripture in the churches in the second, third, and even as late as the fourth, centuries. Athanasius classes it with some of the deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament, and with "The Teaching of the Apostles," as not canonical but useful to be employed in catechetical instruction.

The "Shepherd" has sometimes been called the "Pilgrim's Progress" of the early Church. The question of admitting it into the canon was discussed in more than one council before 212 A. D. According to one old tradition the author is the Hermas who is mentioned in St. Paul's epistle to the Romans (xvi. 14). This view was held by Origen. According to another tradition it was the work of one Hermas, the brother of Pius I., and was written during the episcopate of Pius (140–155). This tradition is supported by the Muratorian Canon. The latter is inconsistent, however, in making Clement of Rome the contemporary of Pius, and its testimony is much weakened by a manifest effort to discredit the work as being the product of a late author. Still another view, adopted by some recent critics, is that the "Shepherd" was the work of a third Hermas, and was written between 90 and 100 A. D. Zahn, who maintains this view, fixes upon 97 as

the date of composition. The references to the Christian ministry in the work indicate a date as early as the latter part of the first century. Lightfoot inclines to accept the tradition that the author was the Hermas of St. Paul. There is, however, much to be said in favor of the third view.

The book opens with an introduction, consisting of four Visions and a Revelation. Then follows the main part of the book, consisting of the shepherd's message to Hermas, in two divisions: the first consisting of Mandates, or Precepts, and the second consisting of Similitudes, or Parables; that is, moral lessons taught by allegory. Preceding the first Vision, Hermas tells us that he had been sold to one Rhoda, with whom, "after many years," he fell in love. While on a journey to Cumæ he slept and dreamed that he was in a vast and difficult land in which he could make no progress. While he was praying and confessing his sins, Rhoda appeared to him from heaven and smilingly charged him with sin. This filled him with horror and grief. Rhoda explained her charge and disappeared. Hermas then sees an old woman in glistening raiment, sitting on a great white chair, with a book in her hand from which she reads. The words are terrible, but Hermas can remember none of them save the last, which comfort him. At length the old woman is led away toward the sea, saying, as she departs: "Play the man, Hermas." This woman he thinks to be the Sibyl, but

later he finds that she is the Church, aged, because "she was created before all things." Before her departure she had given him a book which he sought to copy, but it was suddenly snatched from his hands.

In the second vision Hermas is asked by the woman, who appears to him again, and who has now become youthful in face, but with her flesh and hair aged, if he had given the book to the elders. He is charged to write two little books and to give them, one to Clement and one to Grapte.[1] Clement is to communicate the contents of his book to foreign cities, while Grapte is to instruct the widows and orphans. Hermas is to read the book "to this city along with the elders that preside over the church."

In the third vision the woman, who had now become "altogether youthful and of exceeding great beauty, and her hair alone was aged," makes an appointment with Hermas to meet him in a retired place which he should choose. There she shows him, in a mystical vision, the building of the Church. In this vision he sees, surrounding and supporting the rising tower, seven women, who are named respectively, Faith, Continence, Simplicity, Guilelessness, Reverence, Knowledge, and Love. The relation of these to one another is thus indi-

[1] Grapte is unknown save by this reference. She probably was a prominent deaconess of the church in Rome and a contemporary of Clement.

cated: "from Faith is born Continence, from Continence Simplicity, from Simplicity Guilelessness, from Guilelessness Reverence, from Reverence Knowledge, from Knowledge Love."

The change in the aspect of the woman from age to youth, symbolizes the change of the Church from a state of worldliness and doubt and repining to a state of revived faith and new devotion.

In the fourth Vision Hermas sees in his way a great and terrible beast, which, however, he passes without suffering any harm. This beast is the type of coming persecution, from which he is assured that he shall escape by faithfulness to the Lord.

The Visions proper are now completed. In the Revelation which follows the Visions, Hermas sees a man "glorious in his visage, in the garb of a shepherd, with a white skin wrapt about him, and with a wallet on his shoulders and a staff in his hand." This shepherd is the Angel of Repentance, and he delivers to Hermas certain *Mandates* and *Similitudes*, or *Parables*, which he is commanded to write down.

These *Mandates* enjoin: (1) faith in the one only God; (2) simplicity and guilelessness; (3) love of the truth; (4) purity from sensual lust; (5) long-suffering, "for the Lord dwelleth in long-suffering, but the devil in an angry temper;" (6) righteousness; (7) fear of the Lord and obedience to His Commandments; (8) temperance, defined as abstinence from all that is wicked and the practice of

all that is good; (9) firmness in trust toward God; (10) cheerfulness, — under this head it is interesting to note that the author classes sorrow with doubtful-mindedness and an angry temper as distinctly sinful: "Therefore clothe thyself in cheerfulness, which hath favor with God always, and is acceptable to Him, and rejoice in it. For every cheerful man worketh good, and thinketh good, and despiseth sadness, but the sad man is always committing sin;" (11) discerning the spirits of prophecy: "By his life test the man that hath the divine Spirit;" (12) abstinence from evil desires and the cultivation of good desires.

Concerning obedience to these commandments the shepherd pithily and truly says to Hermas, "If thou set it before thyself that they can be kept, thou wilt easily keep them, and they will not be hard; but if it once enter into thy heart that they cannot be kept by a man, thou wilt not keep them."

After the *Mandates* follow ten *Similitudes*, or *Parables:* (1) of the *foreign city;* (2) of *the elm and the vine.* In this the idea set forth is that the rich man (the elm) by his wealth supplies the material needs of the poor man; while the poor man (the vine), by his intercessions with God, supplies the spiritual wants of the rich man; (3) of *the withered trees:* This world is the winter of the righteous, and in it they are indistinguishable from the sinners; (4) of *the trees, some withered*

and some sprouting: The withered trees are the sinners, and the "sprouting are the righteous who shall dwell in the world to come; for the world to come is summer to the righteous, but winter to the sinners;" (5) of *the vineyard and the good servant*, — showing the nature of a true fast; (6) of *the shepherd and the sheep*, in which is shown the punishment of evil self-indulgence; (7) of *the affliction of the head of the house* for the sake of his family in order to bring them to repentance; (8) of *the willow and its branches*, — a parable of judgment and repentance; (9) of *the twelve mountains* and *the rock* with a *gate* and *the building of the tower*, — this very long and ingeniously elaborate parable is also a parable of judgment and of redemption solely through Christ; (10) of *the virgins* who are henceforth to be the companions of the instructed Hermas.

This outline is too brief to give an adequate idea of a curious and very interesting book. It is easy to see why it should have been so popular in the early Church. In essential particulars its teaching corresponds with that of the epistle of Clement and the apostolic epistles. I note certain points of special interest, in which light is thrown both upon the doctrine and the ethics of the Church at the time when it was written. In its slight reference to the government of the Church it speaks of bishops and teachers and deacons. There is no discrimination between bishops and elders.

On the subject of divorce, it allows the husband to divorce his wife for the one cause mentioned in the New Testament, but it forbids the aggrieved husband to marry again, and, in case of his wife's repentance, bids him receive her back: "If the husband receiveth her not, he sinneth and bringeth great sin upon himself, — nay, one who hath sinned and repented must be received, yet not often; for there is but one repentance for the servants of God. For the sake of her repentance, therefore, the husband ought not to marry." Second marriage is allowed, but discouraged. Concerning the man who takes a second wife, the shepherd says: "He sinneth not, but if he remain single, he investeth himself with more exceeding honor and with great glory before the Lord; yet even if he should marry, he sinneth not."

Fasting is permitted, apparently, but neither enjoined nor encouraged. When Hermas asks instruction on the subject of fasting the shepherd tells him, "Fast thou (unto God) such a fast as this: do no wickedness in thy life, and serve the Lord with a pure heart; observe His commandments and walk in His ordinances, and let no evil desire rise up in thy heart, but believe God. Then if thou shalt do these things, and fear Him, and control thyself from every evil deed, thou shalt live unto God; and if thou do these things, thou shalt accomplish a great fast, and one acceptable to God." Furthermore, the shepherd

commands Hermas, when he fasts, to reckon up the expense of that which he would have eaten and give it to some one in want. The shepherd's instruction reminds us of Herrick's admirable lines: —

"Is this a fast, to keep
The larder lean
And clean
From fat of veals and sheep?

"Is it to quit the dish
Of flesh, yet still
To fill
The platter high with fish?

"Is it to fast an hour,
Or ragg'd to go,
Or show
A downcast look and sour?

"No; 't is a fast to dole
Thy sheaf of wheat
And meat
Unto the hungry soul.

"It is to fast from strife,
From old debate
And hate
To circumcise thy life.

"To show a heart grief-rent;
To starve thy sin,
Not bin;
And that 's to keep thy Lent."

Papias.

Papias, born probably between 60 and 70 A. D., became bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, and, according to the "Chronicon Pascale," died a martyr not far from 160 A. D. He was the contemporary and companion of Polycarp, and, according to Irenæus, he was a hearer of St. John; but Eusebius argues from the words of Papias that, while he heard about the disciples from those who had known them, the John of whom he was immediately the hearer was not John the apostle, but "John the Elder," as Papias himself designates him. The statement of Papias is as follows: —

"On any occasion when a person came [in my way] who had been a follower of the Elders, I would inquire about the discourses of the Elders, — what was said by Andrew or by Peter, or by Philip, or by Thomas or James, or by John or Matthew or any other of the Lord's disciples, and what Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that I could get so much profit from the contents of books as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice."

Late in his life, perhaps between 130 and 140 A. D., Papias published his "Exposition of Oracles of the Lord," which Eusebius speaks of as extant in his time in five volumes. Only a few fragments of this work remain, in the form of quotations found in Irenæus and Eusebius and other ancient writers.

The chief interest in Papias lies in the light which his words throw on questions of New Testament criticism. It is from him that we learn the authorship of the second Gospel. Concerning this he says: —

"And the Elder said this also: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately everything that he remembered, without however recording in order what was either said or done by Christ. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow him; but afterwards, as I said, [attended] Peter, who adapted his instructions to the needs [of his hearers], but had no design of giving a connected account of the Lord's oracles. So, then, Mark made no mistake, while he thus wrote down some things as he remembered them; for he made it his one care not to omit anything that he heard, or to set down any false statement therein."

Papias also says that "Matthew composed the Oracles in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he could." The touching and powerful story told in the first eleven verses of the eighth chapter of St John's Gospel, which is now generally conceded by scholars to be an interpolation, is found in one of the fragments of Papias. This story, originally copied on the margin of the Gospel manuscript, finally crept into the text. It is probable that in this fragment Papias transmits a trustworthy oral tradition of primitive times. It is a great misfortune that so few fragments of the work of Papias remain, especially

since so much has unreasonably been made of the silence of Papias by some critics. Eusebius speaks rather disparagingly of him, saying that "he was very limited in his comprehension, as is evident from his discourses;" but something must be allowed to the prejudice caused by a difference in theological opinions. Eusebius was criticising Papias' view of the millennium.

If some searcher for old manuscripts, in a secluded place in the East, should come across a genuine copy of the writings of Papias, the discovery would be hailed with enthusiastic delight by all the scholars of Christendom.

Ignatius of Antioch.

One of the most striking figures in the early church is Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, according to Eusebius, from 70 or 71 to 109 A. D. About no one in the second century has greater interest gathered than about Ignatius. Almost all the information concerning him that we possess is derived from letters supposed to have been written by him, and a letter written by Polycarp to the church in Philippi.

Of the letters ascribed to Ignatius there are in all fifteen; eight of these, however, are now universally rejected as spurious. The remaining seven exist in two forms, a longer and a shorter. Of these, the shorter are accepted by many leading critics as substantially genuine. It is impossible to

attain absolute certainty as to the Ignatian letters, but in consideration of all the evidence, it seems reasonable to hold, with Lightfoot, that the seven shorter letters are the true work of Ignatius, and especially, because their authenticity is so strongly supported by the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians; of the authenticity of this letter there seems now no reasonable doubt.

The main objection against the authenticity of the Ignatian letters is that they show a more fully developed view of the episcopacy than is shown by any other contemporary evidence. This is a real difficulty, for it is unquestionable that the episcopacy of the Ignatian letters is much like that which we find in the beginning of the third century. But it must be admitted that the episcopacy developed earlier in Asia Minor than in any other part of the empire. Ignatius seems to have been possessed with the idea of the Catholic Church more than perhaps any other man before Cyprian. In his letter to the church in Smyrna occurs this significant statement: "Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; just as wheresoever Jesus Christ is, there is the universal Church (ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία)."

It has also been argued, as notably by Dr. Pfleiderer, that the story of Ignatius' journey as a prisoner to be exposed to wild beasts in Rome is fiction; for there is no other example in the second century of such a transportation of crim-

inals from the place of trial to the Roman amphitheatre; and therefore the letters of Ignatius must be a forgery. To this Dr. Ramsay replies: "It is a commonplace of history that the practice was usual. It was regulated by special enactments, a few of which are preserved to us. If among the small number of cases known to us of Christians exposed to wild beasts no parallel to Ignatius occurs, that is no argument against the general practice. Mommsen expressly argues that the words of the Apocalypse, that Rome was 'drunk with the blood of the martyrs' must be understood as referring to those who were condemned in Eastern provinces and sent to Rome for execution."

Dr. Ramsay dates the Ignatian letters and therefore the martyrdom of Ignatius between 112 and 117. This would put the death of Ignatius in a late, if not the last, year of Trajan's reign. There are some indications in the letters that the church in Ephesus had already been distinguished by the number of its martyrs, and this would seem to justify the inference both that the persecutions under Pliny had already taken place, and that the persecution of Christians had not been confined to Bithynia and Pontus; but it is impossible to prove from the actual words of Ignatius that a general persecution was going on at the time when he wrote. The natural and *prima facie* inference to be drawn from his letters is that he suffered under

a purely local persecution, which must have been brief, for in the course of his journey to Rome he learned that peace had been restored to the church in Antioch. Of the specific causes of this persecution of the church in Antioch we know nothing. I follow substantially Lightfoot, whose labors on this perplexed question have been unsurpassed in ability, thoroughness, and candor.

There are many traditions clustered about the name of Ignatius which, however interesting they may be, cannot be trusted. One of these is that he introduced antiphonal chants into the service of the Church because in a vision he had seen angels praising God in antiphonal hymns.

Ignatius was probably a Greek of Asia Minor. He bore also the name of Theophorus. This, construed in the passive voice, means "borne of God," whence we have the legend that he was one of the children whom Jesus received and blessed; construed actively, it means "God-bearer," whence the legend that when, after his death, his heart was cut to pieces, the Name of Jesus was found in golden letters on every piece.

Of his conversion and his early life we know absolutely nothing. Eusebius says simply that he succeeded Evodius as the second bishop of the church in Antioch. Some later writers have claimed that St. Peter was the first bishop of Antioch, which, of course, would make Ignatius the third; but this is a baseless tradition.

In 109, according to Eusebius, but probably later, and possibly as late as 117, Ignatius was arrested and taken to Rome to be thrown to wild beasts in the Flavian amphitheatre. His route was probably from Antioch to Seleucia, and then by sea to Attalia in Pamphylia; thence by land through Laodicea, Hierapolis, Philadelphia, and Sardis, to Smyrna. It has been observed that there is a suspicious similarity between the journey of Ignatius and the travels of St. Paul in Asia Minor. In Smyrna he spent some time with Polycarp, bishop of the church in that city. Here he wrote his letters to the churches in Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Rome. The last letter was written to dissuade the Christians in Rome from exerting any influence to prevent his martyrdom. He says: —

"I dread your very love, lest it do me an injury; for it is easy for you to do what you will, but for me it is difficult to attain unto God, unless ye shall spare me. . . . For if ye be silent and leave me alone, I am a word of God; but if ye desire my flesh, then I shall be again a mere cry. . . . I write to all the churches, and I bid all men know, that of my own free will I die for God, unless ye should hinder me. I exhort you, be ye not an unreasonable kindness to me. Let me be given to the wild beasts, for through them I can attain unto God. I am God's wheat, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread [of Christ]. Rather entice the wild beasts, that they may become my sepul-

chre and may leave no part of my body behind, so that I may not, when I am fallen asleep, be burdensome to any one. Then I shall be truly a disciple of Jesus Christ, when the world shall not so much as see my body."

In this letter also he describes his journey in the following words: "From Syria even unto Rome I fight with wild beasts, by land and sea, by night and by day, being bound amidst ten leopards, even a company of soldiers, who only wax worse when they are kindly treated. Howbeit through their wrong-doings I become more completely a disciple; yet I am not hereby justified."

This letter to the Romans is the most interesting of the whole seven, and in it his evident passion for martyrdom finds the strongest expression. As with glowing mind and ardent desire he anticipates his fate, he exclaims: "Come fire and cross, and grapplings with wild beasts [cuttings and manglings], wrenching of bones, hacking of limbs, crushings of my whole body, come cruel tortures of the devil to assail me; only be it mine to attain unto Jesus Christ." In all the letters which were written from Smyrna Ignatius earnestly requests prayers on behalf of the church in Syria.

While in Smyrna he received delegates from the churches in Tralles, Magnesia, and Ephesus. From Smyrna he was taken to Alexandria Troas. Here he wrote three more letters, two to the churches in Philadelphia and Smyrna and one to Polycarp.

Here also he learns that his beloved people in Syria once more have peace. He seems to have purposed to write other letters, but intimates that his departure from Troas was sudden. From Alexandria Troas he went by sea to Neapolis, the port of Philippi. In Philippi other martyrs joined the company and together they proceeded to Rome.

The letters of Ignatius thus fall naturally into two groups: the first consisting of letters addressed to the three Asia Minor churches, which he had not visited, and knew only by delegates, and one to the Romans, which apparently was sent on in advance of him by messengers; the second, consisting of two letters to the churches with which he had become personally acquainted on his journey, and one to the bishop Polycarp.

The experience of Ignatius in his travels through Asia Minor strongly confirms the testimony of Pliny as to the multitude of Christians in that territory. It is interesting to note that the pagan Lucian's satire, "De Morte Peregrini," written about 165 A. D., was probably founded immediately upon his knowledge of the journey of Ignatius to Rome.

The letters are of exceeding interest, not because of their intellectual force or range, but because of their intense earnestness, the simplicity of faith and the fervent devotion to Christ which they manifest, and the light which they throw on the

organization of the churches in Asia Minor in the early years of the second century. In them we notice, first, the clearly defined orders of the clergy which they indicate. Bishops are sharply discriminated from presbyters, and both of these from deacons. I quote some passages, selected almost at random, which will clearly set forth the ideas of Ignatius on church order. In the letter to the Magnesians he says: —

"Seeing then that, in the aforementioned persons, I beheld your whole people in faith and embraced them, I advise you, be ye zealous to do all things in godly concord, the bishop presiding after the likeness of God and the presbyters after the likeness of the council of the Apostles, with the deacons also who are most dear to me, having been intrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ, who was with the Father before the worlds and appeared at the end of time. Therefore do ye all study conformity to God and pay reverence one to another; and let no man regard his neighbor after the flesh, but love ye one another in Jesus Christ always. Let there be nothing among you which shall have power to divide you, but be ye united with the bishop and with them that preside over you as an ensample and a lesson of incorruptibility.

Therefore as the Lord did nothing without the Father (being united with Him), either by Himself or by the Aposties, so neither do ye anything without the bishop and the presbyters."

In the letter to the Trallians he says, "In like manner let all men respect the deacons as Jesus

Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of the Father and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of Apostles. Apart from these there is not even the name of a church." "Ye should do nothing without the bishop," he says; "but be ye obedient also to the presbytery, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our hope." He evidently contemplates the deacons as special ministers of the Eucharist, for he calls them "deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ." In his letter to the Ephesians he commends the presbyters for their harmony with the bishop in these words: "For your honorable presbytery, which is worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop, even as its strings to a lyre. Therefore in your concord and harmonious love Jesus Christ is sung."

Ignatius apparently believed that on this matter of church officers he spoke by inspiration, for, in his letter to the Philadelphians, he says: "I spake with a loud voice, with God's own voice. Give heed to the bishop and the presbytery and deacons. . . . He in whom I am bound is my witness that I learned it not from the flesh of man; it was the preaching of the Spirit who spake on this wise: Do nothing without the bishop."

In all the letters of Ignatius there is no trace of sacerdotalism, yet he seems to hold the sacramental idea of the Eucharist, for he calls it "the flesh

of our Saviour Jesus Christ;" but he also speaks of "the Gospel as the flesh of Jesus." In two of his letters he expressly warns his readers against Judaism; for example, in the letter to the Magnesians, where he says: "It is monstrous to talk of Jesus Christ and to practise Judaism. For Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity, wherein every tongue believed and was gathered together unto God." And in the letter to the Philadelphians he says: "But if any one propound Judaism unto you, hear him not; for it is better to hear Christianity from a man who is circumcised than Judaism from one uncircumcised. But if either the one or the other speak not concerning Jesus Christ, I look on them as tombstones and graves of the dead whereon are inscribed only the names of men."

He also warns his readers against Docetism. This Docetism, however, may have been a characteristic of the Judaizing heresy, traces of which he seems to have discovered in the churches of Asia Minor. If it be thought that the time of these letters is too early for the appearance of Docetic doctrine, it will be only necessary to recall the fact that there are notices of a Docetic tendency in the epistles of St. John, and that the "Gospel of St. Peter," a fragment of which was recently recovered, and which is strongly marked by Docetism, was probably written soon after the date of the Ignatian letters. Besides, Gnosticism, which

appeared in the Church, germinally at least, as early as the time of St. Paul, was almost invariably Docetic. All of the epistles of Ignatius, except the one to the Romans, contain warnings against heresies.

It is noteworthy that in his letter to the Romans he makes no reference to any bishop. The same is true of Polycarp's letter to the church in Philippi. These are two significant notes indicating that episcopacy had not yet arisen outside of Asia Minor and Syria. The letters contain several passages specially worthy of remembrance; for example: "Be perfect in your faith and love toward Jesus Christ, for these are the beginning and end of life, — faith is the beginning, and love is the end, — and the two being found in unity are God, while all things else follow in their train unto true nobility." Again: "It is better to keep silence and to be, than to talk and not to be. It is a fine thing to teach if the speaker practise." And still again: "He that truly possesseth the word of Jesus is able also to hearken unto His silence, that he may be perfect."

His letter to Polycarp is full of strong counsel. Thus he says: "Stand thou firm, as an anvil when it is smitten. It is the part of a great athlete to receive blows and be victorious." It is possible that Ignatius personally knew St. John, though there is no reference to his acquaintance with the apostle in his letters; yet in his religious thought

he is evidently an ardent disciple of the school of St. Paul. In the first paragraph of his letter to the Smyrnæans, after the greeting, there is an admirable summary of apostolic doctrine, which has a decided Pauline flavor.

Of the circumstances of Ignatius' death we have no certain knowledge. Polycarp, in his letter to the Philippians, written shortly after the time of the martyr's visit, apparently is aware of the fact of Ignatius' death, but not of the details, for he seeks information concerning this from the Philippians. In the "Acts of Ignatius," the closing events of Ignatius' life are given in great detail, but this account has no historical value. Without doubt Ignatius died in the Flavian amphitheatre, a martyr to his faith.

POLYCARP.

Very different from Ignatius was his contemporary and friend, Polycarp. Of his early life almost nothing is certainly known. He was born about the year 69 or 70. There are stories that he was a slave boy from the East and became the property of a wealthy lady in Smyrna, who, instigated by an angel in a dream, bought him and made him her steward. Moved by the spirit of benevolence, he gave away all her goods, but she suffered no loss, for, as fast as he gave the goods away they were miraculously replenished.

For trustworthy information concerning Poly-

carp, we are indebted to the Ignatian letters, to a letter from the church in Smyrna to the church in Philomenium, which recounts the story of Polycarp's martyrdom, and to Irenæus. He was a fellow-disciple of Papias and a hearer of St. John, and he must have known many who were acquainted with the apostles. According to Tertullian, he was appointed bishop of Smyrna by St. John. Irenæus says more generally that he was appointed "by the apostles."

In a letter which Irenæus wrote to the friend of his boyhood, Florinus, who had fallen into Gnosticism, he thus refers to their mutual early acquaintance with Polycarp: —

"For while I was yet a boy I saw thee in Lower Asia with Polycarp, distinguishing thyself in the royal court,[1] and endeavoring to gain his approbation. For I have a more vivid recollection of what occurred at that time than of recent events (inasmuch as the experiences of childhood, keeping pace with the growth of the soul, become incorporated with it); so that I can even describe the place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit and discourse, — his going out, too, and his coming in — his general mode of life and personal appearance, together with the discourses which he delivered to the people; also how he would speak of his familiar intercourse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord; and how he would call their words to remembrance. Whatsoever things he had heard from them respecting the

[1] Probably the court of T. Aurelius Fulvus, proconsul of Asia.

Lord, both with regard to His miracles and His teaching, Polycarp, having thus received [information] from the eye-witnesses, of the Word of life, would recount them all in harmony with the Scriptures. These things, through God's mercy which was upon me, I then listened to attentively, and treasured them up, not on paper, but in my heart; and I am continually, by God's grace, revolving these things accurately in my mind."

Of this passage Renan exquisitely says: "An echo of Galilee thus made itself heard at a distance of a hundred and twenty years on the shores of another sea."

In his famous work "Against Heresies," Irenæus says: —

"But Polycarp also was not only instructed by apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by apostles in Asia, appointed bishop of the church in Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried [on earth] a very long time, and, when a very old man, gloriously and most nobly suffering martyrdom, departed this life, having always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, and which the Church has handed down, and which alone are true."

When Polycarp was somewhere between forty and forty-seven years of age, he, then being bishop of the church in Smyrna, received and entertained Ignatius, who was on his way to Rome to suffer martyrdom. We know little of the events of his long life. His letter to the Philippians, written shortly after Ignatius' visit, shows him to have

been a man of pure and gentle spirit, less ardent and impetuous than Ignatius, but quite as true in his faith.

Near the close of his life, on account of the Easter controversy which had arisen in the Church, he went to Rome and had a conference with Anicetus, the bishop of the Roman church. Though both Polycarp and Anicetus were firmly fixed in their convictions, and though these convictions were antagonistic to each other, the discussion seems to have been entirely amicable. Anicetus was so won by the gentleness and dignity of the now venerable Polycarp, that he permitted him to celebrate the Eucharist in his church. During his stay in Rome, Polycarp was successful, probably quite as much by force of his spirit and his well-known character as by the force of his arguments, in converting many disciples of Marcion and Valentinus to the orthodox faith.

Irenæus relates an incident of this visit to Rome which, if it be true, shows us that Polycarp was not all meekness in the presence of recognized heresy. The story is that Polycarp on one occasion met Marcion the heretic, who said to him, "Dost thou know me?" Polycarp answered, "I do know thee, the first-born of Satan." "Such," says Irenæus, "was the horror which the apostles and their disciples had against holding even a verbal communication with any corrupters of the truth."

We are reminded of a similar story, found also

in Irenæus, which is told of St. John, who fled in dismay from a public bath-house because Cerinthus, the Gnostic, was within. Irenæus, rebuking Florinus for his heresy, tells him that "if that blessed and apostolical presbyter (Polycarp) had heard any such thing, he would have cried out, and stopped his ears, exclaiming, as he was wont to do: 'O good God, for what time hast Thou reserved me, that I should endure these things!' and he would have fled from the very spot, where sitting or standing, he had heard such words."

Not long after Polycarp's visit to Rome, a severe persecution broke out in Smyrna, and one of the first victims was the venerable bishop. The church historians, following Eusebius and Jerome, have commonly placed this under the reign of Marcus Aurelius, but recent scholars, for example, Lightfoot and others, have placed it as early as 155 or 156 A. D., which would bring it under the reign of Antoninus Pius. A contemporaneous account of this persecution, and especially of the martyrdom of Polycarp, is preserved for us in a letter sent by the Smyrneans to the church in Philomelium. This letter, with the exception of one or two slight interpolations and of the concluding paragraph, is reasonably accepted as genuine. It was probably known to the satirist Lucian. It speaks of the martyrdoms which had taken place in Smyrna, and gives a detailed account of the last days of Polycarp.

The persecution seems to have been due to an outbreak of popular superstitious fury against the Christians. Among the many who suffered was one Germanicus, a right noble confessor, who encouraged his companions in tribulation by his constancy and fearlessness. The proconsul wished to save him, and urged him to sacrifice; but the young man bravely met his fate, even dragging towards him the wild beast to which he was exposed. After his death the multitude raised the cry, "Away with the atheists! Let search be made for Polycarp." Quintus, a newly arrived Phrygian, had ostentatiously pressed forward, and urged on others to the Christian's fate, but when he saw the wild beasts he lost heart, and, yielding to the proconsul, took the oath and offered incense.

Polycarp, when he heard of the persecution, desired to remain in town, but finally yielded to persuasions and withdrew to a farm not far away from the city, where he spent his time in prayer with his companions. Three days before his arrest he fell into a trance, in which he saw his pillow on fire, and turning to those who were with him, he said, "It must needs be that I shall be burned alive."

When sought for he went to another farm. Then his pursuers, not finding him, subjected two slave lads to torture, one of whom confessed the place of Polycarp's retreat. A troop of horsemen and

gendarmes came forthwith to the cottage where the old bishop was found in bed. He still might have escaped, but saying, "The will of God be done," he came down and gave himself up. Giving orders that food and drink should be served to his captors, he asked for an hour in which to pray. "On their consenting, he stood up and prayed, being so full of the grace of God, that for two hours he could not hold his peace, and those that heard were amazed, and many repented that they had come against such a venerable old man."

On the way to the city he was met by Herod, the captain of the police, and his father, Nicetus. These took him into their carriage and urged him to yield, saying: "What harm is there in saying 'Cæsar is Lord,' and offering incense?" But he refused. They then angrily thrust him out of the carriage, but he, though hurt by their roughness, went promptly on toward the stadium. As he entered the stadium it is said he heard a voice from heaven, saying, "Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man."

The proconsul asked him if he were Polycarp, and, receiving an affirmative answer, urged him to have respect to his age and to swear by the genius of Cæsar, and to say, "Away with the atheists!" Polycarp, stretching out his hands towards the multitude, said solemnly: "Away with the atheists!" The magistrate pressed him more earnestly, and said: "Swear the oath and I will release

thee; revile the Christ." Polycarp answered: "Four-score and six years have I been His servant, and he hath done me no wrong. How, then, can I blaspheme my King who saved me?" Being still urged to swear by the genius of Cæsar, he said: "I am a Christian." Being exhorted to "prevail upon the people," Polycarp refused to defend himself. He was then threatened with wild beasts, but he only said: "Call for them! for the repentance from better to worse is a change not permitted to us; but it is a noble thing to change from untowardness to righteousness."

He was threatened with fire, but the brave old bishop was unmoved. The multitudes, excited to fury, demanded that a lion should be let loose upon Polycarp, but this was refused by the magistrate. Then a stake and fagots were prepared, and they were about to nail Polycarp to the stake, but he asked that he might remain at the pile unfastened; so they simply bound him.

A moment's respite was given him in which he might pray. This prayer is so beautiful and impressive that I quote it in full: —

"O Lord God Almighty, the Father of Thy beloved and blessed Son, Jesus Christ, through whom we have received the knowledge of Thee, the God of angels and powers and of all creation and of the whole race of the righteous, who live in Thy presence; I bless Thee for that Thou hast granted me this day and hour, that I might receive a portion amongst the number of martyrs

in the cup of [Thy] Christ unto resurrection of eternal life, both of soul and of body, in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit. May I be received among these in Thy presence this day, as a rich and acceptable sacrifice, as Thou didst prepare and reveal it beforehand, and hast accomplished it, Thou that art the faithful and true God. For this cause, yea, and for all things, I praise thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, through the eternal and heavenly High-Priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, through whom with Him and the Holy Spirit be glory both now [and ever]and for the ages to come. Amen."

After his prayer was ended the fire was lighted and the flame, rushing forth, was caught by the wind, so that it swelled out like a sail, not touching his body. At this an executioner was ordered to stab him with a dagger. The blood gushing from the wound extinguished the fire, but Polycarp was dead. The fire, however, was rekindled and the body was consumed.

"So," says the letter, "it befell the blessed Polycarp, who, having with those from Philadelphia suffered martyrdom in Smyrna, — twelve in all, — is especially remembered more than the others by all men, so that he is talked of even by the heathen in every place; for he showed himself not only a notable teacher, but also a distinguished martyr, whose maryrdom all desire to imitate, seeing that it was after the pattern of the Gospel of Christ."

The only literary work of Polycarp that remains is his letter to the church in Philippi. This letter

was in response to one from the Philippians asking that we would transmit letters from them to Syria. It was accompanied also by letters which had been received in Smyrna from Ignatius in order that they might be read by the Philippians.

Polycarp's letter contains earnest exhortations against heresy, and especially against greed and avarice, an example of which is mentioned in Valens, a former presbyter of the Philippian church, who had been guilty of covetousness and perhaps of fraud.

Polycarp exhorts his readers to faithful endurance, and cites the example of the martyrs Ignatius, Zosimus, and Rufus. He apparently knows of the death of Ignatius, but is ignorant of the details, and seeks information from the Philippians.

Polycarp was not a great man intellectually, but he was pure and devoted and courageous. Through him we have transmitted into the second half of the second century the spirit and the teachings of the apostles.

Of all this sub-apostolic literature, with the exception of the pseudo-Clementines, which are really later, two or three things remain to be said. None of these writings is great as literature; they all lack artistic form, and they are unmarked by any strong intellectuality. But, first of all, they embody, with unswerving faithfulness of testimony, the fundamental facts of the Christian Revelation,

and they all have their centre in Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Saviour of the world. Secondly, they are characterized by great purity and elevation of moral tone; they bear the impress of the moral ideal which Christ exhibited. This differences them to a degree which it is difficult to exaggerate, from all contemporary pagan literature. The morality of these writings is the morality of Christ, which is righteousness, the application of divine love to the whole of human conduct. This quality gives to productions which often are intellectually commonplace a distinction greater and more important than any which dialectical skill or rhetorical brilliancy or even speculative scope and power alone could impart.

The Life implanted by Christ was deeply rooted in the Church. In a little time that Life appropriated to itself, not only all the forms of pagan literature, but also its essential truths, the best elements of its culture, and its greatest powers of philosophical grasp and insight; and these it exalted into means for the expression and vindication of the Christian conception of God and the world and human life and destiny. It is one spirit which underlies and informs the artless epistle of Clement of Rome and the culture-laden "Stromateis" of Clement of Alexandria, the fervent and naïve "Letters of Ignatius," and the massive and profound "First Principles" of Origen.

THE STRUGGLE WITH HEATHENISM: THE PERSECUTIONS.

AT the beginning, neither all that was involved in Christianity, nor the full enterprise which it proposed to its adherents, was apparent to believers. Naturally, despite the transcendent influence of Jesus, the gospel was more or less shaped by the mould which was furnished for it in the minds, the training, and the temper of the first Christians. These were, of course, Jews, and to some extent Jewish ideals determined both their conception of the gospel and their purpose. There is no doubt that some, at least, of the primitive Jewish Christians, believed that the gospel was a new revelation addressed solely to the children of Abraham and designed for their salvation as a people. At any rate there was, at first, no break with Jewish traditions, and no abandonment of Jewish forms; and the Jewish disciples evidently looked for speedy deliverance, both from foreign tyranny and from earthly woes, through the reappearance of their Messiah in great glory and power to judge the world and completely establish His Kingdom.

With the coming of St. Paul upon the field of action a new and startling breadth was given to

the Christian idea. Pauline Christianity contemplated the conquest of the world by the Christian faith. It is apparent at once that St. Paul was truer to Christ, in his interpretation of Christ's mission and his preaching of the gospel, than any of the other apostles had been previous to his entrance upon the work. It is easy for us now to see that Christianity proposed to its adherents the conquest of the entire world by the spiritual forces that resided in the gospel as a divine message, and by the wisdom and strength of the Lord continuously abiding in them and working through them. They were called to a gigantic task. The very breadth of their enterprise is some true measure of the difficulties which they must encounter. They had to meet the universal sinfulness and selfishness of the human heart, the narrowness and exclusiveness of the Jewish temper and religion, the jealousy and hostility of pagan religions, the antipathetic spirit, customs, and organization of pagan society, and the opposition of the Roman government. Strife was inevitable. Jesus had prophetically said, "I came not to cast peace in the earth, but a sword." The Christian experience of the first three centuries was a tragical fulfilment of these words.

The opposition which, in its struggle for existence, Christianity had to meet was: (*a*) Social, (*b*) Religious, and (*c*) Political; and three forms of hostile influence played upon it: (1) The drift

of life; (2) Brute force; and (3) Intellectual criticism. Or, to put the case still more concisely, the opposition which Christianity, in its conflict with heathenism, had to overcome in order, not only to accomplish its mission, but even to survive, was: (1) *Objective*, or that which took the form of persecution; and (2) *Subjective*, or that which took the form of hostile criticism. In this lecture we are to consider the struggle of Christianity with heathenism on its objective side.

Quite from the beginning Christians were subjected to persecution, and, with infrequent interruptions, this persecution continued in various forms until about the end of the first decade of the fourth century. At first the persecutions were entirely Jewish. This was due to the fact that Christianity was for a time confined to Palestine, and also to the fact that until Christianity began to disclose its true nature, through the influence of Paul's preaching and by its rapid development throughout the empire, Romans confounded Christians with Jews, — looking upon the followers of Christ as merely a Jewish sect. Apparently not until the time of Nero (54–68 A. D.) did the Roman government begin to discriminate between Jews and Christians. The infant Church suffered, first of all, from the same spirit in the Jews which had brought Jesus to the cross. Stephen was the first of several distinguished martyrs who were the victims of Jewish hate. This antipathy of the Jews to

their Christian fellow-countrymen manifested itself not only in Palestine but also in Asia Minor and in other parts of the empire. In the time of the revolt of Barcochba (132–135), in the reign of Hadrian, Jewish hostility to Christians caused the violent death of many. During those two or three years of revolutionary turbulence all Christians who fell into the hands of the Jews and refused to renounce Christ and join in the revolt against Hadrian were subjected to severe persecution.

Though this was the last independent act of hostility toward Christianity on the part of Judaism, yet, says Guericke: "In all the succeeding pagan persecutions, the Jews, now scattered throughout the whole world, distinguished themselves by rendering an eager assistance to the Gentile enemies of Christianity."

The reasons for the opposition of the Jews as a people to Christianity are apparent, for the attitude of the latter toward Judaism seemed to menace all that the Jew held most dear. The first outbreak of popular fury at Jerusalem was animated by the same spirit as that which led the Pharisees and Sadducees to seek the destruction of Jesus, and was mainly local; but the teaching of St. Paul, and the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles, made a distinct and irreparable break between the gospel and Judaism as a system. Pauline Christianity abolished circumcision, the

sacrifices, the priesthood, and the authority of the Mosaic law, and contradicted at once the ideas and the hopes which were vital to Judaism.

But it should be said that the Church as a whole did not suffer greatly from Jewish persecution, in comparison with what it suffered from the persecutions which afterwards arose from Gentile sources. Our main concern, therefore, is with the struggle of Christianity with heathenism. The Gentile persecution of the Christians was of two kinds, which we may designate as *Popular* and *Political.* Political persecution, or persecution by the state, did not arise until the early part of the second century. The earlier Roman persecutions, those under Nero and Domitian, were the results of personal tyranny and caprice, and not of intelligent and deliberate attempts to check or suppress Christianity. Some notice of these persecutions will be given later.

Before I begin an historical sketch of the various persecutions which arose against Christians during the period covered by these lectures, I invite you to study briefly the causes and characteristics (1) of the popular hostility to Christianity and (2) of the hostility of the state.

(1) The popular antipathy to the early Christians, if not justifiable, is at least explicable, and in some sense rational; that is, if we can take the pagan's point of view. Christianity by its very nature was aggressive. The consciousness of its

mission, awakened in the Church, first, by St. Paul, rapidly grew into clearness and strength as the Church increased in numbers and in the extent of its conquests. Christians, though they illustrated a loftiness of virtue which the noblest teachings of paganism had been unable to produce, save in rare instances, were from the first intolerant of religions other than their own. They believed that it was their mission to announce a universal faith, and that the polytheistic and idolatrous religions which everywhere they encountered were the product and expression of demonic intelligences. Their intolerance was all the more intense, and, it must be said, all the more justifiable, because the pagan religions were permeated with immorality. To yield to them in any degree would be both to deny the supremacy of Christ and to abandon the pure righteousness which Christ exemplified and which He held up as the authoritative standard and ideal of His followers.

The attitude of Christianity was, therefore, one calculated to excite antagonism. It proposed uncompromisingly the abolition of the religious beliefs and customs which were the heritage of the various peoples. Christians, because they worshipped no visible God and had no temples, were naturally looked upon and denounced as atheists. Excluded by their principles from the greater part of the amusements and festivities of the heathen world, which were everywhere charac-

terized by idolatrous ideas and practices, they drew to themselves, naturally, the charge of unsociability, and by the more passionate and bitter of the heathen they were denounced as "haters of the human race." In so far as the teaching of the gospel was successful, it withdrew men from those occupations which were identified with idol-worship, and caused them to withhold patronage from tradesmen whose every act of buying and selling was consecrated by some pagan ceremony. Thus Christians aroused against themselves the intense hostility of the manufacturing and mercantile classes. The necessary separation of the Christians from much of the social and civic life of the pagans inevitably caused serious division of families, whenever one or more members of a family accepted the gospel. Furthermore, priests and the popular teachers and philosophers rapidly lost their occupation as Christianity extended its influence and increased the number of its adherents. Thus two powerful classes, the sacerdotal and the pedagogic, or rhetorical, were arrayed against the Christians. As an illustration I may cite the case which Eusebius gives us of Crescens, a philosopher of the Cynic school, who, refuted in a discussion by Justin Martyr, in a spirit of vengefulness, denounced him as a Christian and thus caused his death.

The pure morality of the Christians, also, was a continual rebuke of the vices and immoralities of

the people. Vice, when it is in the majority, does not long endure even the silent condemnation which manifest virtue pronounces upon it. Thus fashion, trade, religion, philosophy, and the spirit of licentious self-indulgence, all arrayed themselves powerfully against the new faith. A common and fruitful source of persecution was the prevalent superstition of the masses. The occurrence of plague, or famine, or disaster by fire and flood, was attributed by the people to the wrath of the gods because of the neglect of their worship which the spread of Christianity caused. Again and again were popular outbreaks against the Christians motived by the superstitious fears of the multitude; and, since nothing is so cruel as fear, these outbreaks were characterized by excessive ferocity. Tertullian thus scornfully exclaims: "They think the Christians the cause of every public disaster, of every affliction with which the people are visited. If the Tiber rises as high as the city walls, if the Nile does not send its waters up over the fields, if the heavens give no rain, if there is an earthquake, if there is famine or pestilence, straightway the cry is, 'Away with the Christians to the lion!'"

The popular antipathy to the Christians, and the popular ignorance of the meaning of their simple rites, led to various charges against them of horrible immoralities. I have already mentioned the common charges of "atheism" and

"hatred to the human race." In addition to these, because of the utter popular misapprehension of the Christian ἀγάπαι, or love-feasts, and the celebration of the Eucharist, Christians were charged with indulging in "Thyestean banquets," — with eating human flesh and blood (under which we see a coarse but explicable caricature of the celebration of the Eucharist), — and with licentious orgies of a most revolting character. They were also charged with magic and with treason, — the latter, often, because of their refusal to sacrifice to the images of the emperors.

The Christian Apologies of the time indicate, by their very denials, the character of the evil spirit and customs with which Christians were charged, and throw a strong gleam of light on the prevalent immorality of the society in the midst of which they lived. For example, says Justin Martyr: "We who formerly delighted in fornication, now strive for purity. We who used magical arts, have dedicated ourselves to the good and eternal God. We who loved the acquisition of wealth more than all else, now bring what we have into a common stock and give to every one in need. We who hated and destroyed one another, and on account of their different manners would not receive into our houses men of a different tribe, now, since the coming of Christ, live familiarly with them. We pray for our enemies, and we endeavor to persuade those who hate us

unjustly to live conformably to the beautiful precepts of Christ, to the end that they may become partakers with us of the same joyful hope of a reward from God the Ruler of all."

The author of the Epistle to Diognetus, a noble anonymous writing of the middle of the second century, thus vindicates the character of the Christians: "They dwell in their own countries, but only as sojourners; they bear their share in all things as citizens, and they endure all hardships as strangers. Every foreign country is a fatherland to them, and every fatherland is foreign. They marry like all other men and they beget children; but they do not cast away their offspring. They have their meals in common, but not their wives. They find themselves in the flesh, and yet they live not after the flesh. Their existence is on earth, but their citizenship is in Heaven. They obey the established laws, and they surpass the laws in their own lives. They love all men, and they are persecuted by all. They are ignored, and yet they are condemned. They are put to death, and yet they are endued with life. They are in beggary, and yet they make many rich. They are in want of all things, and yet they abound in all things. They are dishonored, and yet they are glorified in their dishonor. They are evil spoken of, and yet they are vindicated. They are reviled, and they bless; they are insulted, and they respect. Doing good they are punished

as evil-doers; being punished they rejoice, as if they were thereby quickened by life. War is waged against them as aliens by the Jews, and persecution is carried on against them by the Greeks, and yet those that hate them cannot tell the reason of their hostility."

Tertullian, in his Apology, thus challenges the persecutors of the Christians: "And here we call your own acts to witness, you who are daily presiding at the trials of prisoners, and passing sentence upon crimes. Well, in your long lists of those accused of many and various atrocities, has any assassin, any cutpurse, any man guilty of sacrilege, or seduction, or stealing bathers' clothes, his name entered as being a Christian too? Or when Christians are brought before you on the mere ground of their name, is there ever found among them an ill-doer of the sort? It is always with your folk the prison is steaming, the mines are sighing, the wild beasts are fed; it is from you the exhibitors of gladiatorial shows always get their herds of criminals to feed up for the occasion. You find no Christian there, except simply as being such; or if one is there as something else, a Christian he is no longer."

(2) Political persecution, or persecution sanctioned and directed by the state, did not begin, as I have already said, until the early part of the second century. This was due to the fact that not until the Church had attained considerable devel-

opment did it reveal, or itself recognize, its real attitude toward the state; and not until comparatively late did the Roman emperors begin to understand the significance of the new religious movement in the empire, and to suspect the consequences which it involved for the state. The policy of Rome toward the religions of conquered peoples was characterized by tolerant indifference. It was a part of the political wisdom of Rome that it did not attempt to exasperate subject peoples by taking away their gods, or interfering more than was necessary with the internal life of those peoples. But Christianity, when its real claims were understood and something of its real nature began to be appreciated, could not be put in the same category with ethnic religions.

We must remember that Christianity was at first conceived of as the cult of a Jewish sect; there was no discrimination between it and the religion of the Jews. It is true, as Ramsay suggests, that persecutions by the state were determined by the convictions and purposes of the reigning emperor; hence the best emperors, those who were most thoughtful and conscientious, naturally proved the most severe persecutors. The Roman religion was the expression of Roman patriotism. It was the bond of Roman unity and the pledge of Roman prosperity. The claim of Christianity as the universal religion could not for one moment be allowed by the ruler who was

patriotically devoted to the empire. It is quite intelligible therefore that, as Ramsay says, "Severity, degenerating even into cruelty, is characteristic of the best and most upright class of Roman governors; lenity, as a general rule, was the result only of weakness, of partiality, or of carelessness."

Trajan seems to be the first to have had any glimmering sense of what the spread of Christianity meant, yet both Trajan and his immediate successor were suspicious of Christianity more on account of its political than of its distinctively religious aspect. Under the vigorous administration of Pliny in Bithynia and Pontus, the force of the government was directed mainly to the suppression of Christians as forming *collegia*, or *sodalitates*, an edict against such organizations having been promulgated on the express ground that they involved political danger. This difficulty the Christians met by giving up certain social meetings and adapting their organization to the requirements of the edict; but in the meantime many suffered the extreme penalty of the law. From the time of Trajan onward, the more thoughtful and patriotic emperors viewed the growth of Christianity with ever deepening solicitude. Emperors like Marcus Aurelius proscribed Christianity distinctly as a religion, but under the Flavian emperors the ground of procedure against it was its character as a quasi-political organization. There was profound reason for this. The situa-

tion of the Church, surrounded as it was by hostile elements, forced upon it the development of a coherent organization. This, in time, inevitably attracted the attention of the state. It was then seen that in the Church a new empire was growing up within the empire.

Before the middle of the second century each Christian community was ruled by a bishop whose authority tended to become ever more strong. The bishops of the various communities, closely bound to each other by a common purpose, were officially related through synods. The letters of Ignatius undoubtedly powerfully influenced the Church in that line of ecclesiastical development along which the exigencies of the Church's experience urged it. The churches, internally united by a common faith, a common aim, and the conviction of a common destiny, were more closely unified by the pressure of external forces. The means of communication, established during the reign of Augustus, admirably served the Church by enabling it, through frequent messengers passing to and fro between the various parts of the empire, to develop and to keep vivid a common consciousness. In the very nature of the case the Church was a political force of ominous power.

The attitude of Christians toward the state was that of scrupulous obedience to all laws not conflicting with their faith; but laws which were contrary to their faith they must die rather than

obey. Under the influence of the persecutions the idea of a radical antagonism between the Kingdom of God and the Roman state arose and increased in strength, until, during the latter part of the second century, it was not uncommon for martyrs, as they went to the stake or to wild beasts in the amphitheatre, confidently to prophesy the speedy overthrow of the empire. The influence of these prognostications naturally was to increase the hostility of the pagan officials and to aggravate the persecutions. Maintaining a unity independent of the imperial unity, and at every point where their faith came in contact with idolatry opposed to that unity, the Christians were unquestionably maintaining an organization that was contrary to the fundamental principles of Roman government. On this point Ramsay says: —

"Rome had throughout its career made it a fixed principle to rule by dividing; all subjects must look to Rome alone; none might look toward their neighbors, or enter into any agreement or connection with them. But the Christians looked to a non-Roman unity; they decided on common action independent of Rome; they looked on themselves as Christians first, and Roman subjects afterwards; and, when Rome refused to accept this secondary allegiance, they ceased to feel themselves Roman subjects at all. When this was the case, it seems idle to look about for reasons why Rome should proscribe the Christians. If it was true to itself, it must compel obedience; and to do so meant death to all firm Christians."

Had the emperors, as early as the time of Trajan, or even as early as the time of Marcus Aurelius, understood the real significance of Christianity; had they perceived that the Christian idea was more in accord with the imperial idea than that of any or all of the heterogeneous religions which then existed; and had they, recognizing that the chief menace to the empire was the moral deterioration of the masses of the people, and that Christianity bore in itself the only effective check to this, and thus recognizing something of the real significance of the new religion, sincerely welcomed it as an ally, — it is not too much to say that the Roman Empire would have taken a new lease of life which would have preserved its integrity and carried it far down the centuries. This, however, is rather more speculative than practical. It would be too much to hope that an emperor, even of such catholic mind as Hadrian himself, could have risen to the mighty occasion and changed thus early the whole course of civilization. From the moment when Christianity was recognized as a religion, distinct from that of the Jews, down to the time of Gallienus (259–268 A. D.), it was distinctly an illicit religion, and persecution of its adherents was always lawful. In fact, Christianity was an illicit religion, despite the friendly edict of Gallienus, until the "Edict of Milan" in 313.

The history of the persecutions must be told

here with great brevity. It was common for a long time to speak of the "ten persecutions," — a number suggested by the ten plagues of Egypt, and perhaps also by the ten kings making war against the Lamb, in Rev. xvii. 14, — namely, those under Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Maximin, Decius, Valerian, Aurelian, and Diocletian. But, as a matter of fact, there were both less and more than ten persecutions; for, in addition to those mentioned, there were persecutions under Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, and the only two of the persecutions that prevailed throughout the empire were those under Decius and Diocletian.

A little more than three decades after Pentecost the first Roman persecution began under Nero. On the night of July 18th, 64 A. D., fire broke out in the Jews' quarter of Rome and raged six days and nights. After it was subdued, it broke out in another quarter and raged three days. Of the fourteen regions of the city only four entirely escaped. The calamity was immeasurable. It was rumored, and the people believed, that Nero was the instigator of the fire. Tacitus declares that nothing which was done "availed to relieve Nero from the imfamy of being believed to have ordered the conflagration." It is not possible to determine now whether or not the report was true. This much, however, is true, that, in order to counteract the damaging rumor, Nero charged the crime upon

the Christians and punished them with the most exquisite tortures.

Already there was sufficient antipathy, both Jewish and pagan, against the Christians to aid Nero in carrying out his malign purpose. Some Christians were arrested, and if they could not be convicted of kindling the fire, they could be condemned for "hating the human race." A carnival of bloodshed followed. Says Tacitus: "First those were seized who confessed they were Christians; next, on their information, a vast multitude were convicted." Upon these the most horrible torments were employed and new methods of execution were invented. Some were crucified, and others were sewn in the skins of wild beasts and worried by dogs. Christian women were made to personate heathen goddesses on the stage for the amusement of spectators, and, after suffering outrageous insults, were bound to a raging bull and dragged to death.

In the evening the horror reached its climax, for the brutalized populace assembled in Nero's garden to behold a spectacle at once magnificent and fiendish. Christians, swathed from head to foot in tow that was saturated with pitch, were bound to stakes of pine and burned as torches, while Nero drove about attired as a charioteer, and the crowds shouted with delight. A reaction set in, however, begotten by the brutality of Nero, and a feeling of compassion toward the sufferers arose "because they seemed not to be cut off for

the public good, but victims to the ferocity of one man."

This was the first pagan persecution of the Christians, and was confined to Rome. One of its effects was to give Nero an infamous prominence in the minds and in the writings of Christians, as the very incarnation of Anti-Christ. From the time of Nero until the time of Domitian we hear of no more persecutions, nor were there any, apparently, during the earlier years of Domitian's reign. In the later years of his reign Domitian's avarice and suspiciousness marked both Jews and Christians as victims; indeed, he does not seem to have discriminated clearly between the two, and many illustrious Romans also suffered from his cruelty. Of the latter, some were the victims of his blind and malignant fear of assassination, while others, whose estates he confiscated, were the victims of his avarice. It appears that some were condemned, formally, for defection from the religion of the state to Judaism (from which Christianity was not discriminated), or, as the accusation sometimes reads, for "atheism."

Two distinguished victims of this last charge were Flavius Clemens, the Emperor's own cousin, and Domitilla, wife of Clemens. The former was put to death after the close of his consulate, about 96 A. D., and his wife was banished to the Island of Pandateria. There is a tradition that during this persecution St. John was taken to Rome and plunged in a caldron of boiling oil, from which

he emerged unhurt, and then was banished to the isle of Patmos, where he is said to have written the Apocalypse. It was during this time also that Apollonius of Tyana perished, a victim of Domitian. This Apollonius was a wandering sage, much renowned for sanctity and wisdom, who had gathered about him a group of admiring scholars. Long after this time he figured as the Christ of Neoplatonism, a sort of pagan rival of Jesus, and many legends of his miraculous powers and deeds cluster about his name. In that later time it was said that Domitian threw him into prison, but he suddenly disappeared from the sight of his judges, and in the evening presented himself to his friends at Pozzuoli. This story is evidently an imitation of the account in the Gospels of Christ's resurrection. Of Domitian's time there is a tradition, preserved by Eusebius, which in the main is credible. The Emperor heard of some relatives of Jesus who were still living; he was much alarmed, and, summoning them before him, asked them if they were of David's race; they confessed that they were. He asked them how much property they had, and they told him that they had between them only nine thousand denarii (about $1350),[1] and this, not in money, but, in a piece of land, 39 acres in extent, on which they raised their taxes and their living by their own labor. They exhibited their hands showing callouses caused by incessant labor. Domitian

[1] This would correspond to about $13,500 at the present time.

then asked them about Christ and the nature of His Kingdom. They told him that it was not temporal or earthly, but heavenly, and that it would appear at the end of the world when Christ would come in glory to judge the quick and the dead. Upon this Domitian dismissed them as simpletons, and, adds Eusebius, "by a decree ordered the persecution to cease." Hegesippus, to whom Eusebius was indebted for the story, tells us that these humble scions of Hebrew royalty continued to live even to the time of Trajan.

Domitian's successor, who is known as Nerva "the Good," stopped all persecution, recalled those who had been banished, and, partly from his own purse, restored the property which had been confiscated.

We come now to the time of Trajan, under whose reign took place the first real persecution by the state. The chief scene of this persecution was Asia Minor, especially the provinces of Bithynia and Pontus, of which Pliny, the friend of Trajan, was governor. Trajan was a great soldier and administrator, and a thorough Roman, who took a deep interest in all the affairs of the empire, and was more powerfully animated by the imperial idea than any of his predecessors since Augustus. He often has been designated in church histories as "the first who enacted a distinct penal statute against the Christians;" and this is affirmed on the basis of his reply to a letter from Pliny. On the assumption of his office as

governor of Bithynia and Pontus, Pliny found that Christianity had become very prevalent in his province, so much so that the heathen temples were empty, the sacrifices were discontinued, and the ancient religion seemed on the point of perishing from the land. He found also that the multitudes of Christians had organizations and held meetings, which, to him, were in violation of the law against secret societies. He heard also the pagan charges against the Christians of immorality. He promptly instituted proceedings against them, but, embarrassed by the enormous number of the Christians, who were in all the cities and villages and even in rural districts, he was perplexed as to the course which he should take, and wrote his long-since famous letter to Trajan. Trajan's reply was not in the form of an edict, but of a personal letter, in which he enjoined Pliny not to seek out Christians, and not by any means to listen to anonymous accusations; but he reaffirmed the principle that Christians were criminals before the law, and directed that they, if properly indicted, should be tried by regular process of law, and, if they refused to sacrifice, they should be punished by death. From the Roman point of view Trajan's course was moderate and even generous. In Neumann's opinion it cannot be too strongly emphasized that Pliny's assumption, that the name of Christian, if persisted in, deserved the penalty of death, was right, — that is, from the point of view of Roman law; yet Ramsay says that "the sup-

position is excluded that any formal law had been enacted to forbid Christianity. We may safely infer also that no express edict of any Emperor had been issued to suppress Christianity."

Christians were convicted under the law against *sodalitates*, and under the authority which reposed in the governor of preventing Roman citizens from neglecting their duties to the state. Under this authority "Isis-worship was expelled beyond the walls of Rome, the worship of Celtic deities was forbidden to Roman citizens by Augustus, and Romans who professed the Jewish religion were expelled from the city." Trajan's rescript did not initiate procedure against Christians. He did not for the first time lay down the principle that Christians were criminals deserving of death; he simply recognized the existing principle of the imperial government, but desired that the principle should be applied with discretion and mildness. Says Ramsay: "It is one of the most astounding facts in modern historical investigation that so many modern, and especially German, critics of high standing and authority, have reiterated that Trajan was the first to make the Name a crime, and that any Christian document which refers to the Name as a ground for death must be later than his rescript."

Pliny, therefore, vigorously prosecuted Christians as obnoxious to the laws of the empire. The persecution was aggravated by the fanatical enmity of mobs urged on by pagan priests. Mob

violence Pliny sought to restrain, and he insisted that the processes of law should be rigorously followed in the trial of Christians. He made a practice of asking the accused if they were Christians, and when they confessed that they were, he repeated his question, adding the threat of punishment by death. If they persisted in their Christian confession, the law was allowed to take its course, and there is no doubt that a large number were put to death. His investigations convinced Pliny that the Christians were guiltless of the horrible crimes with which they had been charged, but he was not moved from his position that, as Christians merely, they were violators of the law. At this time, probably, the custom of holding the ἀγάπη, or love-feast, was discontinued by the Christians, not because there was anything wrong in it, but simply because it laid them open to the charge of breaking the law against secret societies.

There appear to have been persecutions in other parts of the empire also, though we have no detailed and trustworthy records. It is said that during Trajan's reign Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, was crucified at the age of a hundred and twenty years. During this reign also Ignatius of Antioch was thrown to the lions; it is evident, therefore, that there were persecutions in Syria as well as in Asia Minor.

Hadrian, Trajan's successor, took a dilettantish interest in Christianity, and was little disposed to

adopt severe measures against the Christians. Persecutions continued to some extent, but they were not at all general, nor, apparently, were there any others so severe as the one which took place under Pliny. The Christian apologists of the time urged upon Hadrian the duty of distinctly declaring that Christianity was not in itself a crime, but this he hesitated to do. He did however expressly forbid that popular clamor should have weight against the Christians, and, in general, maintained the principle which had prevailed under Trajan. During Hadrian's reign Telesphorus, bishop of Rome, is said to have suffered martyrdom. He is the first Roman bishop, as far as we know, that fell a victim to persecution. An account has been preserved of a Christian woman named Symphorosa, whose husband and brother had suffered martyrdom for the faith. She was given the choice, for herself and her seven sons, either to sacrifice or to die. She replied: "You think then to turn me by fear, but I wish only to rest in peace with my husband Getulius, whom you have put to death for Christ's name's sake." She was drowned; and her seven sons, one after the other, were killed in various ways.

It sometimes has been assumed that there were no persecutions worthy of note under Antoninus Pius, but evidently there were occasional outbreaks of popular antipathy from which many Christians suffered. These the mild and gracious emperor

sought to restrain. He issued rescripts against paying attention to mere petitions and popular clamor against the Christians. In Greece a severe persecution had arisen, in which Publius, the bishop of Athens, perished. Antoninus sent rescripts to Larissa and Thessalonica, in which he ordered that the limits defined in Trajan's rescript should be carefully observed. On the whole the reign of Antoninus was peaceful and happy, and yet we cannot forget that it was probably in his reign that there broke out in Smyrna the fanatical persecution of which we have such graphic notice in the letter of the church in Smyrna to the church in Philomelium, and in which the venerable Polycarp suffered martyrdom. It is evident, however, that this persecution was popular in its origin and in its violence. The cruelties to which Christians were subjected are thus described in the letter of the Smyrnæans: —

"Who could fail to admire their nobleness and patient endurance and loyalty to the Master? Seeing that when they were so torn by lashes that the mechanism of their flesh was visible even as far as the inward veins and arteries, they endured patiently, so that the very by-standers had pity and wept. . . . And in like manner also, those that were condemned to the wild beasts endured fearful punishments, being made to lie on sharp shells and buffeted with other forms of manifold torture."

The account of Polycarp's suffering and heroism has been given in the preceding lecture.

Marcus Aurelius, who reigned from 161 to 180 A. D., although in personal character perhaps the best of all the Roman emperors from Augustus down, was much the severest and most systematic persecutor of the Christians of all the emperors who preceded Decius. In him the Greek philosophy of the Stoic school combined with Roman power in opposition to Christianity. A good and pure man, whose "Meditations" have long been one of the moral handbooks of the world, he did not understand, and seems not to have tried to understand, the nature of the religion which he persecuted. Nor did he understand, or follow, the broader and more generous policy of Trajan and Hadrian. Marcus Aurelius affords the student of morals an interesting and somewhat perplexing problem. There was much in his character and in his thought that was akin to Christianity, yet he was a firm, and it is not unjust to say even a bigoted, opponent of Christianity? It is not difficult to find inconsistencies between his thought and his action. I cull the following sentences from his "Meditations:" "For who can change men's opinions? and without a change of opinions what else is there than the slavery of men who groan while they pretend to obey?" "Men were made for men. Correct them, then, or endure them." "Correct them, if you can. If not, remember that patience was given you to practise for their good." "It is against its will

that the soul is deprived of virtue. Ever remember this; the thought will make you more gentle to all mankind." "What a soul that is which is ready, if at any moment it must be separated from the body, and ready either to be extinguished or dispersed or continue to exist; but so that this readiness comes from a man's own judgment, not from mere obstinacy, as with the Christians, but considerately and with dignity and in a way to persuade another, without tragic show."

In the light of these sentences, consider the atrocious persecutions which were carried on at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul, apparently under the express sanction of the man who wrote them. Marcus Aurelius issued new edicts against the Christians, which Melito of Sardis declared to be unprecedented. Informers were promised rewards from the property of the accused. This was a distinct bribe to malicious greed, and resulted in the conviction and cruel punishment of many who, otherwise, would have escaped, and even in the conviction of some wealthy people who were innocent of the charge of being Christians. Athenagoras tells us that Christians in large numbers were harassed and fined and plundered and killed. The policy of Trajan, which was not to seek out Christians, was supplanted by a policy of systematic search and prosecution. Christians were ordered to worship idols, and, in the event of their refusal, were punished. Ramsay contends, with

some force, that Marcus Aurelius issued no new edicts on the persecution of Christians, and that there was therefore no formal change of the imperial policy; but he acknowledges that there were imperial instructions to provincial governors which were susceptible of an interpretation that allowed, if it did not distinctly enjoin, rigorous persecution of all followers of Christ. He says: "The lieutenants had the general instructions to seek out and punish sacrilegious persons, etc., and Christians were sacrilegious. The lieutenants might then either carry out the instructions logically, or observe the rescripts of Trajan and Hadrian, forbidding the hunting out of Christians. Under Marcus the logical course was the rule."

It is probably true that the emperor sometimes would have been compelled to yield to popular clamor. The time was one marked by great calamities, such as earthquake, pestilence, and famine. At such times all the superstitious fears of the people were revived, and the old charges against the Christians of being the cause of these calamities were renewed. We must not forget that Christianity had never been legal, and this fact itself constituted a great temptation to those who were opposed to the gospel.

If we have difficulty in understanding how Marcus Aurelius, the wise counsellor of moderation and patience, could have been a persecutor, we must remember that Saul the Pharisee, a man

quite the peer, if not the superior, of Marcus the Stoic, in virtue, was a most bitter persecutor of the first Christians.

During his reign there were addressed to Marcus Aurelius five Christian apologies, — those of Justin, Miltiades, Athenagoras, Apollinaris, and Melito. These apologies seem however to have made no impression on the emperor. The first distinguished martyr of this reign was Justin, who perished in Rome probably in 163 A. D., or a little later. Having been denounced by Crescens, he was brought before the prefect of the city. After giving some account of himself and his life, he was asked by the prefect, "Art thou, then, a Christian?" He replied, "Yes, I am a Christian." After some others present had made the same confession, the prefect turned to Justin and mockingly asked, "Listen, thou who art called learned, and believest that thou knowest the true doctrines, art thou persuaded that when thou shalt have been scourged and beheaded, thou wilt then ascend into heaven?" "I hope," replied Justin, "to receive Christ's gracious gift, when I shall have endured all those things." The conversation continued for some little time, when the prefect angrily demanded that they should all come forward and unite in sacrificing to the gods. The answer was returned, "No right-minded man will leave the worship of God for its opposite." The Christians were threatened with the severest pun-

ishments, but they cheerfully replied: "Do what you will, we are Christians, and do not sacrifice to idols." The prefect then commanded them to be scourged and executed. "Giving praise to God, the martyrs went to the place of execution, where, after being scourged, they were beheaded with the axe."

The following incident, which must have happened shortly before his own death, is related by Justin Martyr. The dissolute wife of a dissolute man was converted, and became anxious to separate from a husband who persisted in extraordinary and unnatural vices. Her friends dissuaded her, and her husband held out hopes of amendment, so that she forced herself to remain with him. After a time, however, he went to Alexandria and plunged anew into debauchery. She then took the step, sent a writ of divorce, and left him. The husband immediately accused her of being a Christian, and caused her arrest. While her case was pending, he got the same charge preferred against Ptolemaus, who had been his wife's instructor in the faith. Ptolemaus was imprisoned. On being brought before the prefect he was asked, "Are you a Christian?" He acknowledged that he was, and was at once condemned to death. One Lucius, who was present, challenged the prefect to justify a decision to punish a man simply for being a Christian. The prefect answered, "You too, are a Christian, I suppose?" Lucius admitted that he

was, and was condemned to death, declaring, as he went to his fate, that he was glad to be free of rulers so unjust, and to depart to the Father and King of Heaven. Still a third, in the same peremptory way, was sent to death.

But the most frightful persecution of which, up to this time, we have any record took place at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul in 177 A. D. An account of this is given in a letter from the churches in Gaul to the churches in Asia Minor which has been preserved by Eusebius. From this letter we learn that the persecution began by the exclusion of Christians from baths, markets, and public houses. This was followed by popular clamors and assaults. Christians were beaten, robbed, stoned and imprisoned. Then they were led to the Forum and, after being interrogated by the tribune, were shut up in prison until the arrival of the governor. From him they received no mercy.

One of the Christians, a young man of high character named Vettius Epagathus, indignantly requested that he might be heard in defence of his brethren, and asserted that in the Christians there was nothing at variance with religion or piety. The governor asked him if he also were a Christian. He replied that he was, and he was immediately placed among the martyrs.

A few of the Christians, dreading torture and death, apostatized, but the most remained firm. Some heathen slaves, under torture, charged the

Christians with cannibalism and incest. This increased the fury of the populace. Blandina, a young slave girl, who, with her mistress, had been arrested, was subjected to torture; but such was her fortitude "that her ingenious tormentors, who relieved and succeeded each other from morning till night, confessed that they were overcome, and had nothing more that they could inflict upon her." They were amazed that she still breathed, after her whole body was "torn asunder and pierced." She was then bound to a stake and exposed to wild beasts, but the beasts refused to touch her, and she was remanded to prison. Again she was brought forth, in company with Ponticus, a youth of fifteen years. Every effort was made to compel them to recant. Blandina, with extraordinary fortitude, exhorted Ponticus to remain firm, which he did to his death. Blandina herself, after being scourged, exposed to the beasts, and well-nigh roasted, was finally thrown into a net and cast before a bull; "and when she had been well tossed by the animal, and had now no longer any sense of what was done to her, by reason of her firm hope, confidence, faith, and her communion with Christ, she too was despatched. Even the Gentiles confessed that no woman among them had ever endured sufferings as many and great as these." Attalus and Alexander were given to the wild beasts.

Sanctus, a deacon, when asked his name and nation, answered, "I am a Christian." He was

tormented by red-hot plates of brass applied to the most tender parts of his body, but he remained unshaken in his faith. His corpse was described "as one continued wound." A certain Biblias had renounced her faith under torture, but in the midst of the torture she repented, and denied her previous confession against the Christians, exclaiming: "How could such as these devour children, who considered it unlawful even to taste the blood of irrational animals?" She too was added to the number of martyrs. Others were confined in dark, filthy holes, with their feet stretched wide apart and fastened in stocks.

Pothinus, the bishop, more than ninety years old, was dragged to the tribunal. When asked by the governor who was the God of the Christians, he said: "If thou art worthy, thou shalt know." He was subjected to cruel abuse and thrown into prison, where he shortly afterwards died. Many of those who renounced their faith were also put to death.

One of the instruments of torture used upon the Christians was an iron chair, heated red-hot, in which they were roasted alive. The bodies of the martyrs were consumed by fire and their ashes thrown into the river Rhone, the heathens mockingly exclaiming, "Now we shall see if they will rise again!"

To the time of Marcus Aurelius belongs the interesting but untrustworthy incident of "the

thundering legion," which is said to have produced an alteration of the emperor's feelings towards the Christians; but, as the incident is reported to have taken place in the year 174, and, as the persecutions in Gaul which we have just been considering occurred in the year 177, the alteration in the emperor's feelings must have been slight and transient.

Marcus Aurelius died in 180. His death was a calamity for the empire, but it was a blessing to the Church. His son and successor, the execrable Commodus, through his very indifference, was favorable to the Christians, and there were no persecutions by the state during his reign of twelve years. There were, however, some irruptions of popular feeling against the Christians; but for about twenty years the Church had peace.

Septimius Severus, who ruled from 193 to 211, was at first favorably inclined to the Christians and protected them from assault, but near the middle of his reign there was a change. In 202 conversion to Christianity was stringently forbidden, and the laws against *collegia illicita* were renewed. After that time the persecutions became very severe. They raged especially in Egypt and Proconsular Africa. In Alexandria, Leonides, the father of Origen, suffered martyrdom, and his son, who was still a youth, was with difficulty restrained from sharing his fate. Potamiæna and her mother, Marcella, may serve as examples of many Christian women

who perished at that time. Potamiæna was beautiful and of noble birth, and distinguished alike for her courage and her chastity. She was subjected to frightful tortures, and finally was slowly put to death by "having boiling pitch poured over different parts of her body, gradually, by little and little, from her feet up to the crown of her head." Basilides, one of the officers who led her to execution, protected her from the insolence of the spectators. The maiden thanked him and said that she should pray for him. The result was the conversion of Basilides to the Christian faith. Not long after, being urged to swear, he refused on the ground that he was a Christian. His companions thought he was jesting, at first, but finding that he persevered in his confession, they took him to the judge, and he was condemned to prison. Some of the Christians went to see him, and asked the cause of his sudden change, and he declared that Potamiæna, three days after her martyrdom, had appeared to him at night, had "placed a crown upon his head, and said that she had entreated the Lord on his account, and had obtained her prayer, and that ere long she would take him with her." Basilides was then baptized, and shortly after was beheaded.

In the city of Scillita, in Numidia, a number of Christians were brought before the proconsul. In repeated interviews the proconsul sought to turn them from their allegiance to Christ, but they all

remained firm in their confession, "We are Christians!" When the proconsul asked if they refused all mercy and pardon, they answered: "In an honorable contest there is no mercy. Do as thou wilt. We will die joyfully for Christ our Lord." At the place of execution they were beheaded while they were kneeling in prayer.

A little later a number suffered martyrdom in Carthage. Among these were two young women, named Perpetua and Felicitas, who were only catechumens when they were arrested, but received baptism while they were in prison. Perpetua had recently become a mother, and she went to prison with her baby in her arms. Although she was threatened with torture and wild beasts, and exhorted by her aged pagan father to recant, she remained firm. The two young women, scarcely more than girls, were at length put into a net and exposed to a wild cow. Such was the coolness and fortitude of Perpetua that, when her hair and dress were disarranged by the assaults of the furious beast, she calmly rearranged them. To the soldier who came finally to give the death-blow, she said, "Be strong, and think of my faith, and let not all this make thee waver, but strengthen thee." The two young martyrs, having given each other the kiss of peace, were despatched with daggers. The young gladiator who was to kill Perpetua was so moved that his hand trembled, and the young martyr "laid her hand on his and guided it to her throat for the death blow."

Under Caracalla there were persecutions in many places, but they gradually ceased, and from that time until about 235 A. D. the churches had rest.

Maximin, a Thracian, who was raised to the throne by the soldiers, in 235, was hostile to the Christians. According to Eusebius, he commanded that the presidents only of the Christian communities should be put to death, since they were esteemed the real causes of the spread of the gospel. During his reign popular fury was awakened against the Christians in Cappadocia by the occurrence of frightful earthquakes, and many of them were put to death, or compelled to flee. There were persecutions in various parts of the empire. In Rome, Pontianus, a bishop, was banished to the mines of Sardinia, where he died from ill-treatment. Origen escaped death in Cappadocia, only by being concealed in the house of the Christian virgin Juliana. Protoctetus, a presbyter of Cæsarea and his friend, Ambrosius, were dragged from prison to prison, even as far, apparently, as Germany, and, after enduring many sufferings, escaped barely with their lives, — the latter being robbed of most of his property.

For ten or twelve years the Christians were, in the main, free from attack, but under Decius, from 249 to 251, the Church suffered more severely than at any previous time in its history. Decius was the first emperor who systematically conceived and thoroughly sought to carry out the entire sup-

pression of Christianity. He was not wantonly cruel, like Nero or Domitian, and, while he was quite as conscientious as Marcus Aurelius, he was much more consistent and thorough. In 250 he issued an edict which required all Christians to perform the religious ceremonies of the Roman state. Christians were given full opportunity to recant, and in case of their failure to do this they were dealt with promptly and rigorously, and prefects were threatened with severe penalties if they did not compel the Christians to resume the ancestral religion. The storm under Decius seems to have been foreboded by both Origen and Cyprian. The latter saw in the persecutions a divine judgment on the laxity of life into which many Christians had fallen. The comparatively long time of peace had brought many into the Church who had not the moral fibre to endure severe trial. The local magistrates, everywhere acting under the instructions of the emperor, fixed a definite term during which Christians might appear and sacrifice to the gods. At first, death was not inflicted on many except the bishops, who were treated rigorously as ringleaders in mischief. Christians who left their native land during the brief term of probation were not pursued, but their property was confiscated, and they were forbidden to return on pain of death. Those who remained and refused to comply with the edict were summoned before a commission of investigation

If they refused to recant they were threatened and given further time. If they still refused they were subjected to torture. If this failed to conquer their resolution they were thrust into prison, where many died of hunger and hardship. The fortitude of the Christians provoked increased severity on the part of the emperor, and prefects who were disposed to be mild were replaced by others who were more strict.

The first result of the persecution was the more or less open apostasy of very many professing Christians. Cyprian scornfully complains: "Before the battle many were conquered, and, without having met the enemy, were cut down; they did not even seek to gain the reputation of having sacrificed against their will." Many who did not sacrifice purchased from venal officials certificates that they had sacrificed. Among those who openly recanted and offered sacrifice were some who, stricken by remorse for their unfaithfulness, lost their reason. "A Christian woman in Carthage, after she had pronounced the word by which she renounced Christ, became dumb, and could not utter another word. Another went directly from the sacrifice to the bath, and when she returned had become insane."

Of the apostates there were three classes: those who sacrificed, called *sacrificati*, those who strewed incense on the altars, called *thurificati*, and those who offered neither sacrifice nor incense, but pur-

chased from government officers certificates of having complied with the edict, called *libellatici*. All of these were designated by the Church as *lapsi*, or the lapsed. Those who remained steadfast in their faith and suffered persecution, but escaped death, were known as "confessors." The way in which the Church should deal with the lapsed shortly afterwards constituted a large and difficult problem in church discipline. Notwithstanding the number of those who through weakness or insincerity fell from the faith, there were great numbers who were not wanting in Christian heroism. In Rome the bishop, Fabianus, was put to death. He was followed in the episcopate by Cornelius, who was banished and then executed. Lucius succeeded him, and he, in turn, soon received the martyr's crown. These brave men, like color-bearers in the thick of the battle, each grasped the standard as it fell from the hand of his predecessor, resolved that nothing should bring it to the ground. The noted virgins Victoria, Anatolia, and Agatha, and a great multitude of other Christians perished under frightful tortures. In Alexandria, while there were many apostates, there were also many martyrs. Some of these were victims of popular assault before the official process of the law could take place. Metras, an old man, was commanded to speak blasphemies, and, on his refusal, was stoned to death. Quinta, a woman, was brought into the temple and com-

manded to worship idols, and, when she refused, the mob dragged her by the feet through the city. Apollonia, a virgin, because she would not blaspheme, had her teeth broken and was then burnt at the stake. A boy, Dioscurus, only fifteen years old, replied to his persecutors with such aptness and showed such courage under torture that, finally, the prefect, overcome by admiration for the heroic lad, released him. In the Thebaid a Christian husband and wife were fixed side by side to crosses, in which condition they lived for some days, encouraging one another to constancy. Alexander, the bishop of Jerusalem, and Babylas, the bishop of Antioch, were tortured to death. Saturninus, the bishop of Toulouse, was bound to a wild bull and dragged to death. In Carthage many Christians perished in dungeons, others were overcome by torture, and others were executed. Cyprian tells us of a certain Numidicus who had encouraged many to endure martyrdom, and was himself the victim of the persecutors. Cyprian says that Numidicus, "by his exhortation sent before himself an abundant number of martyrs, slain by stones and by the flames, and beheld with joy his wife abiding by his side, burned (I should rather say, preserved) together with the rest. He himself, half consumed, overwhelmed with stones, and left for dead, — when afterwards his daughter, with the anxious consideration of affection, sought for the corpse of her father, —

was found half dead, was drawn out and revived, and remained unconquered from among the companions whom he himself had sent before." After his recovery he was ordained presbyter by Cyprian.

A characteristic feature of this persecution was that the persecutors sought primarily, not the death of the Christians, but their apostasy from the Christian faith. The result was that torture was applied everywhere with unrelenting rigor and persistence. This fact accounts for many recantations. It is much easier to meet death at once, than it is to endure days of excruciating pain. The Christians were thrown into prison, loaded with chains, and their limbs stretched on the rack; their fingers were crushed, their joints dislocated, and their flesh torn with nails and hooks. Sometimes the victims were exposed to extreme heat, and left for days in the torture of thirst. They were burnt with charcoal and red-hot irons. Some were stripped, smeared with honey, and exposed to the sting of insects. Everywhere the Christians were insulted, stoned, beaten, robbed of their possessions, and, in case they were constant to their faith, put to death.

Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage, at the beginning of the persecution withdrew to a place of safety. This he did, not because of cowardice, but because he felt that he was necessary to the Church, and, from his place of exile, he sent mes-

sages of consolation and encouragement to the Christians, and guided their conduct through the severe trial which they were undergoing.

These days of extraordinary affliction, as a dark foil, brought out the resplendent character which the religion of Christ had produced among the Christians all over the world. The ultimate effect of it was to intensify the power of the faith which Decius sought in vain to extinguish. On the death of Decius, who fell in the war against the Goths in 251, there was a momentary lull of the storm, but it soon revived.

Under Gallus official persecution was checked by political troubles, but a pestilence which devastated Proconsular Africa revived the popular fury against the Christians. In Carthage the Christians, under the guidance of Cyprian, though exposed to the violence of their persecutors as well as to the pestilence, buried the dead, and cared for the sick, pagan as well as Christian, and thus checked the spread of the plague and appeased the pagan rage.

Valerian, who ascended the throne in 254, was at first favorable to the Christians, but, under the influence of Macrian, his confidant, his feelings changed, and then he sought to carry out the principles of his former master, Decius. At first he hoped to accomplish his end, in the main, without bloodshed. He issued an edict exiling the clergy, and forbidding the meeting of Christian

congregations. Prayers at the graves of the martyrs were also forbidden. The exiled bishops, among whom was Cyprian, became missionaries of the faith, and at the same time lost none of their influence over their flocks, with whom they kept in constant communication.

In 258 Valerian issued a second edict, commanding that all bishops, presbyters, and deacons should at once be put to death; that all Christian senators and magistrates should lose their property, and, if they refused to abjure Christ, should be put to death; that all Christian ladies of rank were to lose their property and go into exile; and that members of the imperial household who were or had ever been Christians were to be sent to work in chains on the imperial estates. This edict was distinctly different from all preceding edicts, in that it assigned definite statutable penalties to the various classes of Christians, whereas, previously, penalties had been at the discretion of magistrates; it also was distinctly aimed at the clergy and the higher classes of the people. Almost all the martyrs of this period were from these classes. Under this edict many Christians suffered by scourging and by severe labor in the mines, and multitudes were put to death. In Rome, the bishop Sixtus was arrested while holding divine service in the Catacombs. After being sentenced he was taken back and beheaded on the spot where, a little time before, he had celebrated the Lord's Supper. His

deacon Laurentius met him on his way to death, and said: "Whither goest thou, father, without thy son? Whither, priest, without thy deacon?" The bishop replied: "Cease weeping; thou wilt soon follow me." Four days afterwards the deacon was roasted to death in an iron chair.

In Carthage Cyprian, who had withdrawn from persecution under Decius, was besought again to save himself, on account of his duty to the Church, but he refused. When it was known that he was arrested, an immense crowd gathered in the prætorium. The hearing is thus summarily reported: "Thou art Thascius Cyprianus?" — "I am." — "Thou hast permitted thyself to be made an official in a sacrilegious sect?" — "Yes." — "The sacred Emperors have commanded thee to sacrifice." — "That I will not do." — "Consider it well." — "Do what is commanded thee; in a cause so just no reflection is needed." After a brief consultation the sentence was pronounced: "Thascius Cyprianus shall be executed with the sword." Cyprian answered, "Thanks be to God!" He disrobed himself, knelt down and prayed, and the executioner dealt the fatal blow.

A presbyter in Carthage, named Montanus, when he was led to execution tore in two pieces the bandage which had been bound over his eyes, and asked that one piece might be given to his fellow-presbyter, Flavianus. A few days later the eyes of Flavianus were bound with this fragment of cloth, and he was beheaded.

Valerian was succeeded in 259 by Gallienus. The latter is thus characterized by Mœller: "Gallienus, a dilettante in every sort of science and art, but a ruler of infirm and weak character, afforded rest to the Christians, so that he has been designated the first to afford Christianity legal toleration. As a matter of fact, he withdrew the harsh regulations hitherto in force, and allowed the Christians again to obtain possession of their houses of assembly and their burial places."

Aurelian, who succeeded Gallienus in 270, seems to have been restrained for a time by the edict of his predecessor, but shortly before his death he signed an edict for a new persecution, which, however, was not carried out.

For about forty years the Church had rest. During this time the question as to how the "lapsed" members should be treated engaged the attention of the Church, and caused much debate. A considerable party was in favor of the rigorous exclusion of all who in any way had been faithless, but the majority favored milder measures. The problem was complicated and made more difficult by the action of "confessors." These, who had gained enormous prestige by their sufferings for the gospel, exercised a powerful influence upon many Christians, and, presuming on this influence, they often gave to the "lapsed" letters, or "certificates of peace," on the strength of which the lapsed demanded readmission to the

Lord's Supper, in some cases even without penitence or confession. The course which was finally settled upon, and in the main pursued, was one in which strictness and leniency were combined for the correction and restoration of delinquents and the gradual establishment of order in the Church. During the long respite from persecution the Church revived with great energy. The storm had purified the air, the power of the gospel had received fresh and glorious witness in the faithfulness of the martyrs, and the preaching services of the Church, now thrown open to all, were thronged with eager hearers. Everywhere the number of believers multiplied, and new meeting-houses were built and old ones were enlarged. It seemed almost as if the very persecution which had been designed to extinguish Christianity had accomplished its universal triumph. But another and a final struggle was to come.

In 284 Diocletian, the son of a Dalmatian female slave, who had risen to eminence in the army, was chosen emperor by the generals. The empire, which for many years had been steadily changing in character, from this time almost ceased to be Roman. The army, which practically ruled the empire, was a motley host of Germans, Goths, Gauls, Africans, Greeks, and Persians. It is said that Probus, on one occasion, admitted sixteen thousand Germans in a single day.

Diocletian established his residence not in Rome

but in Nicomedia, and there lived in the midst of an Oriental court which was characterized by Oriental magnificence and ceremonial. He devised a new scheme of government, in which there were to be two Emperors and two Cæsars, — the latter to succeed the emperors in case of their resignation or death. To avoid the danger of imbecile rulers, the emperors were to resign at the end of twenty years.

Diocletian, who had thus abandoned the Roman idea of the State, sought to restore, as he conceived it, the ancient religion. He was very superstitious and was "ever devoted to the sacred customs" of heathenism. A struggle between Diocletian and Christianity was inevitable. Lactantius relates that one day a solemn sacrifice was offered in the presence of the emperor in order that he might inspect the entrails. Among the officials present were a number of Christians, who, according to their custom, made the sign of the cross. The entrails did not give the hoped for indications. The sacrifice was repeated, with the same disappointing result. Then Tagis, the chief priest, exclaimed: "The gods refuse to appear at our sacrifice because profane men are present, and hinder the revelation by means of the sign which the gods hate." The effect of this incident upon the mind of Diocletian, it is said, was to determine him to persecute the Christians.

Diocletian had associated with himself Galerius,

who, by virtue of his military talents, had risen from the rank of shepherd to that of Cæsar. This Galerius was the son of a woman who was a devotee of the Phrygian orgies. He had married Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian, who, if not a confessed Christian, was in sympathy with the Christians. Galerius, himself, was a coarse, ignorant, fanatical, and implacable pagan. He urged Diocletian to persecute the Christians. This the emperor was unwilling to do. His policy for nearly twenty years had been one of peace. He knew that to persecute would cause great disturbance in the empire, and would probably be fruitless. He knew, by all the experience of the past, that Christians were not afraid to die. He finally consented to the issuance of an order that all the soldiers in the army should attend the sacrifices. The only result of this was the prompt resignation of many officers and privates. Then a council of leading men was called, and this council, dominated by the influence of Hierocles, governor of Palmyra, who had written a treatise against Christianity, recommended persecution. Diocletian, still reluctant, finally consulted the oracle of Apollo at Miletus. He received only the ambiguous answer that the god could not speak the truth because of the Christians. At last he yielded, but would have no bloodshed.

Early in 303 a decree was issued for the destruction of all the Christian churches and Christian

scriptures. In addition, all Christian officials of the government were to be deposed, Christian slaves were to forfeit the possibility of manumission, and Christian priests were to be apprehended and forced to sacrifice. The edict, which had been posted in a public place, was torn down by an over-zealous Christian, who was immediately arrested and roasted to death. Shortly after, a fire broke out in the palace, and this was charged by Galerius upon the Christians. A second fire broke out in the palace, and civil disturbances arose in Antioch and Melitene, and Christians were charged with causing them. Finally Diocletian resolved on decisive measures. Everywhere the clergy were thrust into prison, till the prisons were crowded with victims. The edict for the destruction of the Scriptures created among the Christians a new class of the "lapsed;" those who gave up copies of the sacred writings were called *traditores.* Some of the Christians, instead of giving up the sacred writings, gave up other books, and there were officials who were willing to be deceived in this way. This effort to exterminate the Scriptures is probably the main cause of the rarity, in later centuries, of very early manuscripts of the New Testament and other Christian writings.

Near the end of the year 303, Diocletian issued an edict that the Christian clergy, provided they would sacrifice, might be released from prison, but if they refused they might be subjected to any

kind of torture. The result of this was the apostasy of many of the clergy and the torture and death of many others. In May, 305, Diocletian and his co-ruler, Maximian, abdicated. Galerius and Constantius were now the emperors. A year later Constantius died at York, England, and his son, Constantine, supported by his army, assumed the purple. About the same time Maxentius was elected emperor by the troops and people of Rome, and by him Maximian was restored to power. It was a time of extraordinary political confusion. In 308 there were no less than six emperors, of whom Constantine was one.

In the meantime, persecution against the Christians had been vigorously carried on by Galerius. He issued an edict that they should be put to death with slow fire. Heathen fanaticism intensified the horrors of the persecution. Christians were hung up by the feet, and fires were kindled beneath them. Their noses and ears were cut off, their tongues and eyes were torn out, and their feet were maimed by cutting through the sinews. Melted lead was poured over them, and then their bodies were cut in pieces. The corpses were not allowed to be buried, but were left the prey of dogs and vultures. Christian maidens were scourged half naked up and down the street. Many, who were exposed to the unbridled lust of the heathen, sought death rather than submit to dishonor.

"At last," says Uhlhorn, "the fire of persecution

burned itself out. The brute force and the raging fanaticism which characterized these last outbursts, could accomplish nothing against the silent endurance of the Christians. Heathenism had exhausted all its powers. Even the executioners were wearied. The heathen themselves began to denounce the useless effusion of blood, and to take the part of the persecuted Christians."

In 311, Galerius, dying of a loathsome disease, the result of his debaucheries, issued an edict which put an end to the persecution. This edict is a curiosity in historical literature. It denounced the Christians as apostates, and claimed that the persecutions had been prompted by benevolence, and it made a bid for their prayers by promising them toleration, and closed with a clause which could be used at any time to annul the edict.

During these years Constantine, who was favorable to Christianity, was steadily winning his way to supreme power. His chief struggle was with Maxentius, whom he utterly defeated at the Milvian bridge, near Rome, October 28th, 312. Before the battle, it is said, he had seen in the heavens the vision of a banner bearing a cross on which was the legend Ἐν τούτῳ νίκα, "By this conquer." In March of the following year, in conjunction with Licinius, Constantine issued the famous "Edict of Milan," which established unrestricted liberty in religion. In this edict it was laid down as a principle that it is no business of the State to refuse

freedom of religion, and that questions of belief according to one's own free will must be left to the judgment and desire of each individual. "This edict," says Plummer, "is the great charter of liberty of conscience."

For ten years bitter persecution had raged throughout the empire. All the forces of civil government, re-enforced by the violence of fanatical mobs, had been put forth to exterminate the Christian faith. The result of all was the utter and final defeat of heathenism. One is filled with wonder over the fact that, despite the nature of the Christian faith, Christians, being human, did so patiently bear all the indignities and cruelties put upon them by their enemies. As early as the time of Septimius Severus they were so numerous as well-nigh to justify the extraordinary claims of Tertullian, yet there is no case on record of forcible resistance to persecution; and in the reign of Diocletian, when they had so increased that they might have easily accomplished a successful revolution, they bore with patience and fortitude, every variety of indignity, oppression, torture, and death, affording thus the most convincing evidence of the divineness of their faith.

"The conflict with external heathenism was over; the struggle with the heathenism in the Church was to take its place." The Church had conquered, not by force of arms, but by its power of enduring all things in the strength of a living

faith in God. In the space of 280 years the religion preached in Judea by a handful of fishermen, disciples of a crucified Jew, had, by its own inherent energy, overcome the united powers of pagan religion, pagan society, pagan government and pagan arms, and had grasped the sceptre which henceforth it was to wield over all the nations of the world.

THE STRUGGLE WITH HEATHENISM: THE APOLOGISTS.

THE Church in its conflict with heathenism had to meet, not only the assaults of persecution, but also the more subtle and more dangerous opposition of the drift of life. By their very faith Christians were committed to a life of purity, in the midst of a society in which many forms of vice were so thoroughly incorporated that only to the Christian did they appear as vice. The traditions, the habits, and the associations of the heathen were so inimical to Christian life that usually the only safety for converts from heathenism lay in a complete break with the life which was about them, and a steady resistance to its influence. That Christians stood fast, and developed a virtue which not only was invincible to the assaults of heathen vice, but also contributed powerfully to the triumph of Christianity, is a conspicuous evidence of the divine communication and impulse that they had received.

But, in addition to all the social and political opposition which it met, the Christian faith had to meet also the intellectual attack from both Jews and pagans. This attack was the more formidable

because at the beginning all the weapons of literature — of style and dialectic — were in the hands of the enemy. In meeting this attack the Church produced the apologetic writings of the first three centuries.

From the beginning Christianity had some expression in writing, but this was confined, at first, to the letters of the apostles, especially of St. Paul. Simultaneously with these, or a little later than these, arose memoirs of the life and reports of the teachings of Christ. Of these the four canonical Gospels are the sifted survivors. In our study of the Apostolic Fathers we have seen how a certain literature grew up, beginning with the epistles of Clement and Barnabas; but the sub-apostolic writings, down to the time of Justin Martyr, can scarcely be classed as literature. These writings were wanting in the point and style that characterized pagan literature. Christianity was not long, however, in appropriating to itself the best weapons in the literary armory. At first uncultivated and naïve, the Christians did not attempt to enter the field of intellectual combat, but soon they gained confidence and began to produce writings that, in form at least, were fashioned after the pagan models. It is characteristic of Christianity, and profoundly interesting, that "in less than three centuries from the death of St. John, the Church had appropriated every form of literature known to paganism, — the apology, the

allegory, the dialogue, the romance, the history, the essay, the oration, the commentary, the hymn, and the didactic poem."

In this literary development, which did not fairly begin until the middle of the second century, apologetic literature led the way. It is impossible within the limits of present space to consider even cursorily the whole Christian literature that was produced before the council of Nicæa. Much of that literature has perished, but that which remains fills some twenty-four stout octavo volumes. It will be necessary therefore for us to confine our attention to the study simply of the apologetic literature, and still further, to representative specimens of that.

Many of the early Christian apologies were defences, not of Christianity as a system, but of Christians. Christians were accused as violators of the law, as guilty of evil and immoral practices, and as enemies of the human race. To these charges there were many replies which vindicated the virtue and patriotism and piety of the Christians. Soon, however, the apologists passed on from the defence of Christians to the exposition and vindication of the Christian revelation. They began to take the offensive, and to show, not only the injustice and inconsistency of the pagan attacks, but also the absurdity and immorality of the pagan religions, and the superiority to all these of the religion of Christ.

Among the early apologies, therefore, we have two classes: (*a*) those that were in defence of Christians; (*b*) those that were in defence and enforcement of Christianity as the true religion. These two classes practically include the whole of the early apologetic literature. The apologies may also be divided into (*a*) those addressed to Jews, and (*b*) those addressed to pagans. The main arguments of the Jews against Christianity were: (1) that Jesus, by the humbleness of His circumstances and the ignominiousness of His death, contradicted the glorious representations of the Messiah which are found in the Prophets; (2) that Jesus, by His claim of peculiar kinship to God, violated the divine Unity, and was guilty of blasphemy. To these attacks Christian apologists replied by the more rational and adequate interpretation of the Old Testament writings. The arguments of pagan writers were more numerous and more various. They opposed Christianity because it was "new, and therefore untrue," — an argument that is familiar to theologians even in our own day. They denied the credibility of the Christian miracles, especially the chief miracle, namely, the Resurrection of Jesus. A common argument was that Christianity was a religion of ignorant fanatics. The familiar charges which were urged in order to incite or justify persecution appeared over and over again in the literary attacks of paganism upon Christianity: for example, that Christians were un-

patriotic and unsocial; that they were atheists; that they were sacrilegious; that they practised magic; and that they indulged in secret and unmentionable immoralities.

These charges were vigorously and successfully met by the apologists. It was not until the time of Celsus, the latter part of the second century, that a literary assault upon Christianity was made of sufficient scope and force to merit our attention. Lucian indulged in coarse ridicule of Christians, especially in his "De Morte Peregrini," but the main attack was made by Celsus. The latter, a passionate and able opponent of the Christian religion, wrote a book which Origen considered of sufficient importance to call from him a careful and elaborate reply. Celsus' work has perished, but the entire substance of its argument has been preserved in Origen's book.

It is interesting to observe that there have been few arguments urged by sceptics against Christianity, during the centuries since the time of Origen, that were not stated or suggested by Celsus. The consideration of Origen's reply to Celsus will come up later.

The apologists who undertook to defend Christianity by expounding and enforcing it as the true religion may be divided into two schools. The first of these schools recognized a strong affinity between Christianity and human reason and conscience; the second saw nothing in human nature

but utter weakness and wickedness. Of the latter school Arnobius may be taken as a representative. The first school may be divided into two sections: the first section is composed of those who took the broad view that in the religions and philosophies of antiquity there was much truth anticipative of Christianity. These are represented by Clement of Alexandria. The second section took the narrower view that, while there is in the unsophisticated reason a natural appetency for truth, the systems of pagan religion and philosophy are to be condemned as false, and "the so-called philosophers were patrons rather of falsehood and heresy than of the truth." Of these Tertullian may stand as representative.

Many of the early apologies were addressed to the emperors, but they seem to have had little favorable effect. It has been asserted that Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, and even Marcus Aurelius, were influenced by the apologies to such an extent as to modify the official treatment of Christians; but this is questionable. On the other hand, it is not unlikely that Tertullian's apology excited Septimius Severus to sterner measures against Christianity than he might otherwise have taken. Such a scathing and scornful exhibition of pagan immorality and injustice and folly must have been peculiarly exasperating to Roman officials. But, whatever may have been the effect of the Christian apologies on the emperors, they certainly had the

effect upon the people of stimulating thought, and of concentrating attention on the real principles and claims of the Christian faith. The truth is, however, that the greatest achievements of the early Christians were in the field, not of literature, but of life. Their most powerful apologetics were their virtue, their patient endurance of outrage and suffering, and their lofty faith in God.

It is significant that the apologists who took the liberal view of religion and philosophy antecedent to Christianity, wrote Greek, while the apologists who took the narrower view, with one exception, wrote Latin. The latter, with Tertullian in the lead, representing, as they did, the Roman type of mind in contrast with the Greek, were the precursors of that Latin theology which, under the powerful influence of Augustine, became dominant in the Western church in the fifth century, and, joined with an ecclesiasticism which was moulded by the Roman spirit and method of organization, has ruled it almost to the present time. The former, with Clement of Alexandria and Origen as early representatives, elaborated that conception of truth and of the Christian revelation which is embodied in the great theology of the Greek Fathers, and which is having a renascence in our day.

I shall now proceed to give a brief sketch of the life and work of some of the early apologists. One of the earliest apologetic writings with which we are acquainted is the anonymous piece known as

the "Epistle to Diognetus," which dates probably from the first half of the second century, — as early as 150 A. D., if not earlier. For a long time this epistle was ascribed to Justin Martyr, but evidently it was not by him. Lightfoot ventures the conjecture that the author was Pantænus, the reputed founder of the Christian catechetical school in Alexandria, which would date the epistle somewhere between 180 and 210. Even a conjecture by Lightfoot is worthy of serious attention, and there are characteristics of the epistle which readily lend themselves to support this conjecture. Birks and others ascribe the epistle to a certain Ambrose, an Athenian Christian, who, about 177, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, defends himself against the charge of fanaticism in a letter to Diognetus, a former tutor of the emperor. But on the whole the argument for a much earlier date seems stronger.

The epistle begins as follows: —

"Since I see, most excellent Diognetus, that thou art exceedingly anxious to understand the religion of the Christians, and that thy inquiries respecting them are distinctly and carefully made, as to what God they trust and how they worship Him, that they all disregard the world and despise death, and take no account of those who are regarded as gods by the Greeks, neither observe the superstition of the Jews, and as to the nature of the affection which they entertain one to another, and of this new development or interest, which has entered into

men's lives now and not before: I gladly welcome this zeal in thee, and I ask of God, Who supplieth both the speaking and the hearing to us, that it may be granted to myself to speak in such a way that thou mayest be made better by the hearing, and to thee that thou mayest so listen that I the speaker may not be disappointed."

In the succeeding chapters, or rather paragraphs, the author, with great purity and dignity of style, sets forth the vanity and worthlessness of idols and the folly of worshipping them; and the defectiveness of the Jewish worship and religious customs. Then follows a statement of the position, and a representation of the character, of Christians, unsurpassed if not unequalled in all the early Christian literature. This I have quoted at length in the preceding lecture.[1] The author then sets forth the revelation of the invisible God by His Son, —

"the very Artificer and Creator of the Universe Himself, by Whom He made the heavens, by Whom He enclosed the sea in its proper bounds, Whose mysteries all the elements faithfully observe, from Whom [the sun] hath received even the measure of the courses of the day to keep them, Whom the moon obeys as He bids her shine by night, Whom the stars obey as they follow the course of the moon, by Whom all things are ordered and bounded and placed in subjection, the heavens and the things that are in the heavens, the earth and the things that are in the earth, the sea and the things that are in the sea, fire, air, abyss, the things that are in the heights, the things that

[1] See page 172.

are in the depths, the things that are between the two. Him He sent unto them. Was He sent, think you, as any man might suppose, to establish a sovereignty, to inspire fear and terror? Not so. But in gentleness [and] meekness has He sent Him, as a king might send his son who is a king. He sent Him, as sending God; He sent Him, as [a man] unto men; He sent Him, as Saviour, as using persuasion, not force: for force is no attribute of God. He sent Him, as summoning, not as persecuting; He sent Him, as loving, not as judging."

In the succeeding paragraphs the author shows that in the Son is revealed the good and benevolent nature of God; by Him is salvation; and through Him man becomes an imitator of God. The last two paragraphs of the letter are evidently added by another hand. The apologetic value of this noble writing lies in its lofty conception and impressive presentation of the Christian faith. Says Birks: —

"Lost in the crowd of predecessors whom Irenæus and Clement hardly ever name, and merged in Justin's shadow, convinced that God alone can reveal Himself, and content to be hidden in his Saviour's righteousness, the old writer has gradually emerged by virtue of an inborn lustre, obscurest at once and most brilliant of his contemporaries, and has cast a glory on the early Church while remaining himself unknown."

JUSTIN the martyr, or, as he is universally called, Justin Martyr, as if the word which designates the manner of his death were a proper name, has been

called "the true founder of Christian apology." Almost all that we know of his life is derived from his writings, especially from the "Dialogue with Trypho." He was born in Flavia Neapolis, a city built in honor of Vespasian near the site of the ancient Shechem in Samaria. It survives in the modern town of Nablous. The date of his birth is unknown, but it must have been early in the second century, perhaps as early as 114 A. D. Though born in Samaria and calling himself a Samaritan, Justin was probably a Gentile of Greek extraction. His father bore the Roman name, Priscus, and his grandfather the Greek name, Bacchius. Apparently he had inherited some property. He was brought up in the heathen customs and received a thorough Greek education. As a youth he was evidently of serious and ardent mind, and early gave himself to the search for truth. In this search he betook himself to the philosophers of the various current schools.

He first went to a Stoic, with whom he spent considerable time, but, finding that he acquired no further knowledge of God, and that his master not only had none himself but did not even think such knowledge necessary, he left him and went to a Peripatetic. The new master soon disgusted his pupil by his mercenary spirit, after the first few days requesting Justin "to settle the fee in order that [their] intercourse might not be unprofitable." Justin then sought a very celebrated Pythagorean,

"a man," he says dryly, "who thought much of his own wisdom." This master required of his pupil, as a preliminary, a knowledge of music, astronomy, and geometry, and finding that the pupil was ignorant of these dismissed him. Then Justin went to a Platonist, "a sagacious man, holding a high position among the Platonists." Whether this was in Flavia Neapolis or in Ephesus is not certain, but, from Justin's language, it is fair to infer that it was in the latter place.

He found his new master much more satisfactory than any of his predecessors. "I progressed," he says, "and made the greatest improvements daily. And the perception of immaterial things quite overpowered me, and the contemplation of ideas furnished my mind with wings, so that in a little while I supposed that I had become wise; and such was my stupidity, I expected forthwith to look upon God, for this is the end of Plato's philosophy." He had not yet, however, attained peace.

The manner of his conversion to Christianity is very interestingly told by himself in his "Dialogue with Trypho." One day, while walking in a certain field not far from the sea, where he was accustomed to go for the sake of quietness, that he might meditate without interruption, an old man of "meek and venerable manners" followed him at a little distance. Justin turned about and fixed his eyes keenly upon him; at which he said: "Do you know me?"

"'I replied,' says Justin, 'in the negative.' 'Why, then,' said he to me, 'do you so look at me?' 'I am astonished,' I said, 'because you have chanced to be in my company in the same place; for I had not expected to see any man here.' And he says to me, 'I am concerned about some of my household. These are gone away from me; and therefore have I come to make personal search for them, if, perhaps, they shall make their appearance somewhere. But why are *you* here?' said he to me. 'I delight,' said I, 'in such walks, where my attention is not distracted, for converse with myself is uninterrupted; and such places are most fit for philology!' 'Are you, then, a lover of words,' said he, 'but no lover of deeds or of truth? and do you not aim at being a practical man so much as being a sophist?'"

Justin answers that "it is necessary for every man to philosophize, and to esteem this the greatest and most honorable work." The old man inquires if, then, philosophy makes happiness. Justin answers that it does. When asked further, "What is philosophy?" he replies that "it is the knowledge of that which really exists, and a clear perception of the truth; and happiness is the reward of such knowledge and wisdom." The old man then questions him about God. In the course of the conversation on this theme, with a weightiness and intelligence which were new to Justin, the old man referred him to teachers older than all the philosophers, — "men blessed and upright and beloved of God, who spoke by the

Spirit of God, and are called Prophets." These had borne testimony and worked wonders to the honor and glory of God the Father, and of His Christ. He concluded the conversation with the words, "Pray thou, then, that the gates of the Light may be opened too for thee; for these things can only be seen and known by those to whom God and His Christ have given understanding." The old man then went away and Justin saw him no more, but "straightway," he says, "a flame was kindled in my soul; and a love of the prophets, and of those men who are friends of Christ, possessed me; and whilst revolving his words in my mind, I found this philosophy alone to be safe and profitable."

The date of Justin's conversion we can only conjecture, but it must have been before the revolt under Barcochba, which would put it before 132 A. D. His conversion was thorough, and he thenceforth gave himself wholly to the work of diffusing the knowledge of the Christian faith. He kept his philosopher's cloak, and went about in the manner of the philosophers, teaching the doctrines of Christianity. It is even said that he established some sort of a school in Rome, in his later years, but of this there is no distinct evidence.

He was a man with little imagination but with considerable force of intelligence, of ardent but self-controlled temper and great courage, and of simple and noble character. Some one has said

of him that "he wrote like a man full of Christianity." It is characteristic of the man as well as of the time that, in his "Apologies," he defended Christians, rather than Christianity; and, after all, this is the true defence, for it is the life rather than the theology that is of first importance.

Of Justin's writings but three of those known to be genuine are extant. These are the "Dialogue with Trypho" and two "Apologies;" the second of the "Apologies," however, is a sequel, or appendix, of the first. Some of Justin's writings certainly have been lost, and some well-known writings have been wrongly ascribed to him. Of writings ascribed to Justin, concerning the authenticity of which critics are divided, there survive "An Address to the Greeks," "A Hortatory Address to the Greeks," "On the Sole Government of God," and fragments of a work on the Resurrection. These are all early, none of them being later than the third century.

The "Dialogue with Trypho," which defends Christianity against Jewish attack, must be passed with brief notice. In it Justin explains and justifies the non-observance of the Mosaic law by Christians; maintains that this law has been abrogated and replaced by the new revelation, which was prophetically and germinally in the old; shows that salvation and true righteousness are obtainable only through Christ; vindicates the Messiahship and divinity of Christ by elaborate proofs drawn

from the Old Testament; asserts that the fables about Bacchus, Hercules and Æsculapius, and the mysteries of Mithras, the Persian sun-god, are an invention of the devil; and foretells the coming restoration of Jerusalem and the thousand years' reign of the saints with Christ after the Resurrection. Much of this book is taken up with expositions of prophecies in the Old Testament about Christ, some of which are as fantastic as Justin's little imagination will allow. For example, he sees in the outstretched hands of Moses, praying against Amalek, the prophetic sign of the cross; finds types of Pharisees in the bulls, and of Herod in the roaring lion that beset the Psalmist; and discovers a figure of the Church in the marriages of Jacob. The "Dialogue" has great value as an example of early Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. It also throws considerable light on the belief and practice of Christians at the middle of the second century.

The "Apologies," as we have them, consist of two, the first, written probably about 150, addressed to Antoninus Pius and his associates in the empire, and the second, written several years later, addressed to the Roman Senate. The first "Apology" may be divided into three parts. The first part begins with a demand for justice to the Christians, refutes the charges against them, and vindicates their innocence. The second part sets forth the truth of Christianity and shows how it

came to be misunderstood through the influence of demons. In Justin's writings, as in many other early Christian writings, the demons and the pagan deities are identical. The third part, which is very brief, describes the worship and customs of the Christians, and ends with a copy of Hadrian's epistle on behalf of the Christians addressed to Minucius Fundanus. In the course of this apology Justin vigorously attacks the heathen worship and customs, expounds the prophecies concerning Christ's coming and work and death, and sets forth the majesty of Christ. He charges the demons, not only with misleading men concerning the true nature of Christianity, but also with causing the persecution of Christians. He claims that Plato was under obligation to Moses for his doctrine of the creation, and also that Plato prophetically intimated the doctrine of the cross. He apparently identifies baptism with regeneration, describes the Eucharist as a participation in the Body and Blood of Christ, and justifies the observance of Sunday for worship and ministry to the needy. "Sunday," he says, "is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day, on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day

of the Sun, having appeared to his apostles and disciples, He taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration."

In the second "Apology," addressed to the Roman Senate, Justin recounts the persecution of Christians by Urbicus, prefect of Rome, and shows his injustice by citing specific cases. He accuses Crescens, a Cynic philosopher, of ignorant prejudice against the Christians. He vindicates Divine Providence and asserts the certainty of judgment against sinners. In chapter x. he claims whatever truth was uttered by law-givers or philosophers before Christ as belonging to the Word, and cites Socrates with approval, as one who "was accused of the very same crimes as ourselves. For they said that he was introducing new divinities, and did not consider those to be gods whom the State recognized;" and he thus contrasts Socrates with Christ: —

"For no one trusted in Socrates so as to die for his doctrine, but in Christ, who was partially known even by Socrates (for He was and is the Word who is in every man, and who foretold the things that were to come to pass both through the prophets and in His own person when he was made of like passions, and taught these things), not only philosophers and scholars believed, but also artisans and people entirely uneducated, despising both glory and fear of death; since He is a power of the ineffable Father, and not the mere instrument of human reason."

He confesses that while he was still a Platonist, and heard the Christians slandered, he was convinced of their sincerity by their patience and fortitude under suffering, and their fearlessness of death. Perhaps the most significant passage in this "Apology" is that in which Justin sets forth his doctrine of the "spermatic word." He says:

"I confess that I both boast myself, and with all my strength strive to be found, a Christian; not because the teachings of Plato are different from those of Christ, but because they are not in all respects similar, as neither are those of the others, Stoics, and poets, and historians. For each man spoke well in proportion to the share he had of the spermatic word, seeing what was related to it. But they who contradict themselves on the more important points appear not to have possessed the heavenly wisdom, and the knowledge which cannot be spoken against. Whatever things were rightly said among all men are the property of us Christians. For next to God, we worship and love the Word who is from the Unbegotten and Ineffable God, since also He became man for our sakes, that, becoming a partaker of our sufferings, he might also bring us healing. For all the writers were able to see realities darkly through the sowing of the implanted Word that was in them. For the seed and imitation imparted according to capacity is one thing, and quite another is the thing itself, of which there is the participation and imitation according to the grace which is from Him."

Justin prays that his little book may be published in order that men "may have a fair chance

of being freed from erroneous notions," and so be inclined to justice toward the Christians; denounces the wicked and deceitful doctrine of Simon the Samaritan; and closes with the prayer "that all men everywhere may be counted worthy of the truth. And would that you also, in a manner becoming piety and philosophy, would for your own sakes judge justly!" He suffered martyrdom, probably in 163 under Marcus Aurelius, sentence being pronounced and executed in the same day.

One of the most striking and picturesque figures among the early apologists is that of TATIAN, who was a contemporary and disciple, and probably a convert, of Justin Martyr. He was born in Assyria, possibly of Greek parentage, between 110 and 120 A. D. Apparently he was of good birth and possessed of some fortune. He received a thorough Greek education, diligently cultivated his mind, and developed literary powers of a high order, for, though in his "Address to the Greeks" he scorns the elegancies of style, he yet shows his exceptional capacity for literary expression. Like Justin he had an ardent desire for the truth. Urged by this desire he visited many lands, studied all the religions with which he came in contact, and even learned the sacred mysteries in Greece. In his "Address to the Greeks" he says: "The things which I have thus set before you I have not

learned at second hand. I have visited many lands; I have followed rhetoric, like yourselves; I have fallen in with many arts and inventions; and finally, when sojourning in the city of the Romans, I inspected the multiplicity of statues brought thither by you."

About 150 he went to Rome. By this time he had become thoroughly disgusted with the debasing immoralities of the heathen religions; "having everywhere," as he says, "examined the religious rites performed by the effeminate and the pathic, and having found among the Romans their Latiarian Jupiter delighting in human gore and the blood of slaughtered men, and Artemis not far from the great city, sanctioning acts of the same kind, and one demon here and another there, instigating to the perpetration of evil." In Rome, Justin drew his attention to "certain barbaric writings, too old to be compared with the opinions of the Greeks, and too divine to be compared with their errors." These "barbaric writings" were the Old Testament Scriptures. The simplicity and modesty of the style of these Scriptures, as well as the loftiness of their doctrine, drew him by an irresistible charm. He sought instruction in the Christian faith, and became a member of the church in Rome. Here he lived for some years, working in harmony with Justin, vigorously defending the faith, and assailing the licentiousness and folly of the pagan religions. He also in-

structed converts, among whom were one Rhodon, of whose writings Eusebius has preserved some fragments, and, possibly, also Clement of Alexandria, since Clement speaks of having had a teacher who "was born in the land of Assyria."

After the death of Justin Martyr, Tatian seems to have imbibed Gnostic ideas, and, about 172, he was excommunicated as a heretic. He then returned to the East, where he lived some years near Antioch in Syria, and died about 180 at Edessa. In these last years he was at the head of the Encratites, an ascetical sect of Gnostics. Their name means the "Self-controlled." Tatian was the author of many works, of which only two survive, but the titles of four others are well known. The two that have survived are his "Address to the Greeks" and his "Diatessaron."

Among the Gnostic ideas of Tatian are these: with Valentinus he believed in certain Æons, or emanations from the supreme Deity, of which the Logos or Word was chief; with Marcion he believed that the God of the Old Testament was the Demiurge, and was inferior to the God of the New Testament; he affirmed the non-salvability of Adam; condemned marriage; and inculcated abstinence from animal food and from wine. He modified the celebration of the Lord's Supper by the use of water instead of wine.

His "Address to the Greeks" was written about 152 A. D. This work is more polemical than apolo-

getic, and, in so far as it is apologetic, it is a defence of Christianity rather than of Christians. Tatian, though he was widely instructed in the pagan philosophies and religions, has no sympathy with them, sees no good in them, and finds not analogies but contrasts between them and Christianity. The tone of his "Address" is defiant and aggressive. The style is abrupt and passionate, and wilfully devoid of elegance; yet it is often very powerful. He is a master of scornful invective. He begins his "Address" by attacking the self-conceit of the Greeks, showing that they are indebted for their various arts and sciences to others whom they contemptuously call "Barbarians."

"For which of your institutions," he asks, "has not been derived from the Barbarians? The most eminent of the Telmessians invented the art of divining by dreams; the Carians, that of prognosticating by the stars; the Phrygians and the most ancient Isaurians, augury by the flight of birds; the Cyprians, the art of inspecting victims. To the Babylonians you owe astronomy; to the Persians, magic; to the Egyptians, geometry; to the Phœnicians, instruction by alphabetic writing. Cease, then, to miscall these imitations inventions of your own. Orpheus, again, taught you poetry and song; from him, too, you learned the mysteries. The Tuscans taught you the plastic art; from the annals of the Egyptians you learned to write history; you acquired the art of playing the flute from Marsyas and Olympus, — these two rustic Phrygians

constructed the harmony of the shepherd's pipe. The Tyrrhenians invented the trumpet; the Cyclops, the smith's art; and a woman who was formerly a queen of the Persians, as Hellanicus tells us, the method of joining together epistolary tablets: her name was Atossa. Wherefore lay aside this conceit."

He derides them for their inability accurately to pronounce their own language, and scoffs at the venality of their rhetoricians. He thus ridicules the philosophers: —

"Diogenes, who made such a parade of his independence with his tub, . . . lost his life by gluttony. Aristippus, walking about in a purple robe, led a profligate life, in accordance with his professed opinions. Plato, a philosopher, was sold by Dionysius for his gormandizing propensities. And Aristotle, who absurdly placed a limit to Providence and made happiness to consist in the things which give pleasure, quite contrary to his duty as a preceptor, flattered Alexander, forgetful that he was but a youth; and he, showing how well he had learned the lessons of his master, because his friend would not worship him, shut him up and carried him about like a bear or a leopard. . . . Let such men philosophize for me!"

He powerfully vindicates the Christian worship of God alone.

"Man," he says, "is to be honored as a fellow-man; God alone is to be feared, — He who is not visible to human eyes, nor comes within compass of human art. Only when I am commanded to deny Him, will I not obey, but will rather die than show myself false and

ungrateful. . . . I refuse to adore that workmanship which He has made for our sakes. The sun and moon were made for us: how, then, can I adore my own servants? How can I speak of stocks and stones as gods?"

He declares that the creation of the world was by the Logos, who springs forth from God by His simple will: who "came into being by participation, not by abscission." He maintains the Christian doctrine of the resurrection, and exclaims: "Even though fire destroy all traces of my flesh, the world receives the vaporized matter; and though dispersed through rivers and seas, or torn in pieces by wild beasts, I am laid up in the storehouses of a wealthy Lord." He ascribes the fall of man to the influence of angels who, turning away from God, became demons; but he does not relieve man of responsibility for the fall, because he was free to choose the good. With the fallen angels, who have become demons by their separation from the Creator, or Logos, he identifies the pagan gods, and, with fierce scorn, he recounts their vices and follies among mankind. These demons are the cause of superstitions, but the sins of men are due not to Fate but to free-will. Of the first man he predicates two kinds of spirits, "One of which is called the soul (ψυχή), but the other is greater than the soul, an image and likeness of God." By sin the latter is lost, and with it is lost immortality.

"The soul," says Tatian, "is not in itself immortal, O Greeks, but mortal. Yet it is possible for it not to die. If, indeed, it knows not the truth, it dies, and is dissolved with the body, but rises again at last at the end of the world with the body, receiving death by punishment in immortality. But again, if it acquires the knowledge of God, it dies not, although for a time it be dissolved."

He declares the necessity of union with the Holy Spirit as the ground of immortality. In several succeeding chapters he shows the deceptions which demons practise on mankind, and denounces against them a punishment severer than that which will be visited on men; but, true to his doctrine of free-will, he maintains that depravity lies at the bottom of demon-worship. He ridicules the solemnities of the Greeks and denounces their popular amusements, both in the arena and on the stage; and scornfully depicts the boastings and quarrels of their philosophers, and derides the futility of their studies. "While inquiring what God is, you are ignorant of what is in yourselves; and, while staring all agape at the sky, you stumble into pitfalls. The reading of your books is like walking through a labyrinth, and their readers resemble the cask of the Danaïds."

He protests that the Christians are hated unjustly, and condemns the Greek legislation. In the closing chapters he shows that the Christian philosophy is much older than the Greek, and exhibits the superiority of the Christian doctrine.

He nobly vindicates the character of Christian women, as contrasted with the frivolous and licentious Greek women. He cites the testimony of the Chaldeans, the Phœnicians and the Egyptians, to prove the superior antiquity of Moses, and gives a list of the Argive kings, who are all shown to be comparatively recent, while Moses is both more ancient and more credible than the heathen heroes. The "Address" concludes with the words: —

"These things, O Greeks, I, Tatian, a disciple of the barbaric philosophy, have composed for you. I was born in the land of the Assyrians, having been first instructed in your doctrines, and afterwards in those which I now undertake to proclaim. Henceforward, knowing who God is and what is His work, I present myself to you prepared for an examination concerning my doctrines, while I adhere immovably to that mode of life which is according to God."

The "Diatessaron," while not strictly an apologetic work, is of such significance and interest that I must devote to it a few words. From Eusebius and others it was known that Tatian had composed a harmony of the Gospels, and that this harmony was almost universally used in the Syrian churches for two centuries or more after his time. For many centuries the "Diatessaron" was lost from view, save as it survived, in a fragmentary shape, in a commentary upon it by Ephraem Syrus. In 1719 Stephen Assemani claimed that

a certain Arabic manuscript in the Vatican was a copy of Tatian's "Diatessaron." This seems not to have received the attention which it merited. In 1881, the German scholar, Zahn, published the "Diatessaron," reconstructed from quotations found in the Syrian Fathers, using chiefly the "Commentary" of Ephraem Syrus. Incited by this work, an Italian scholar, Agostino Ciasca, examined the Vatican manuscript and wrote an essay upon it in 1883, in which he announced his purpose to publish the manuscript itself. Three years later, Ciasca came into possession of another manuscript, which was sent from Egypt to the Borgian museum in Rome by its owner, Halim Dos Galî. This manuscript proved to be a more complete copy of Tatian's work, translated from Syriac into Arabic early in the eleventh century; the present copy having been made not later than the fourteenth century. This manuscript, carefully edited, has recently been translated into English.[1]

The "Diatessaron" is a composite of the four canonical Gospels. It was made by Tatian probably before 160 A. D. Its value is very great because of the convincing proof which it furnishes that our four Gospels were in existence, and were recognized as authoritative in the Church, as early at least, as 140 A. D., since these Gospels are evidently identical with the "Memoirs" to which

[1] It is published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

reference is made by Justin Martyr. The "Diatessaron," therefore, puts forever at rest the contention that the Fourth Gospel was produced late in the second, or early in the third, century. It also disproves the theory of the late invention of the miracles ascribed to Christ in the four Gospels.

The works of Tatian have doubtless suffered in the estimation of ecclesiastical writers because of the ban of heresy which was put upon him on account of his Gnostic tendencies. Irenæus, who wrote "Against Heresies," bitterly, but probably not altogether justly, denounces Tatian. Tatian's work on the Gospels, in its importance to the Christian scholarship of our time, is outranked by no other single work of the second century.

A little later in his apologetic work than either Justin Martyr or Tatian, was ATHENAGORAS. Of the life of Athenagoras almost nothing is clearly known, and his name is seldom mentioned in early ecclesiastical history. He seems to have been an Athenian philosopher, who was converted to Christianity by reading the Sacred Scriptures for the purpose of refuting them. A writer of the fifth century says that he was the first head of the Christian school in Alexandria, and it has been conjectured, on the ground of certain internal evidence, that his book, "Concerning the Resurrection," was written in Alexandria. In 177 he addressed to Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus an "Embassy" on behalf of the Christians.

Of the other works which he wrote only one has come down to us, the treatise on the resurrection of the dead.

Athenagoras was certainly a man of wide culture and of much acuteness and strength of mind, and he was possessed of fine literary art. His "Apology," or "Embassy," is elegantly written, abounds in quotations from the pagan poets and philosophers, as well as from the sacred Scriptures, and is characterized by great tact and logical force. Within the field which it covers it is probably the strongest, as well as the most interesting, Christian apologetic writing of the second century. In his desire to conciliate, the author indulges in some pardonable flattery of the emperors. In the first chapter he protests against the unjust discrimination against the Christians, in that they are condemned simply on account of their name.

"Why," he asks, "is a mere name odious to you? Names are not deserving of hatred: it is the unjust act that calls for penalty and punishment. . . . We venture, therefore, to lay a statement of our case before you — and you will learn from this discourse that we suffer unjustly, and contrary to all law and reason — and we beseech you to bestow some consideration upon us also, that we may cease at length to be slaughtered at the instigation of false accusers. For the fine imposed by our persecutors does not aim merely at our property, nor their insults at our reputation, nor the damage they do us at any other of our greater interests. These we hold in

contempt, though to the generality they appear matters of great importance; for we have learned, not only not to return blow for blow, nor to go to law with those who plunder and rob us, but to those who smite us on one side of the face to offer the other side also, and to those who take away our coat to give likewise our cloak. But, when we have surrendered our property, they plot against our very bodies and souls, pouring upon us wholesale charges of crimes of which we are guiltless even in thought."

In the second chapter he vigorously, and yet with much tact, urges the just claim of Christians to be treated as others are when accused. "If, indeed," he says, "any one can convict us of a crime, be it small or great, we do not ask to be excused from punishment, but are prepared to undergo the sharpest and most merciless inflictions." He demands, what is conceded as the common right of all, that Christians shall not be hated and punished merely because they are called Christians, but be fairly tried and if guilty, convicted and punished, and acquitted if innocent. The three charges which he meets are the familiar ones of atheism, cannibalism, and incest.

The larger part of the "Apology" (chapters iv. — xxx.) is taken up with an elaborate refutation of the charge of atheism. He defends the Christian belief in the unity of God, and cites in corroboration the poets and the philosophers; he shows also the superiority of the Christian doctrine, and points out the absurdities of polytheism.

The charge of atheism is refuted by the character of the Christians' life. He justifies the Christians for not offering sacrifices, and exhibits the inconsistency of their accusers, since the latter "do not all acknowledge the same gods."

In two fine chapters he sets forth the distinction between God and matter, and the reasons why Christians do not worship the universe: —

"Beautiful without doubt is the world. . . . yet it is not this, but its Artificer, that we must worship. For when any of your subjects come to you, they do not neglect to pay their homage to you, their rulers and lords, from whom they will obtain whatever they need, and address themselves to the magnificence of your palace. . . . If, therefore, the world is an instrument in tune, and moving in well-measured time, I adore the Being who gave its harmony, and strikes its notes, and sings the accordant strain, and not the instrument. For at the musical contests the adjudicators do not pass by the lute-players and crown the lutes."

He then cites the testimony of the poets and philosophers to prove that the pagan gods have been created and therefore are perishable. "How can the constitution of these gods remain," he asks, "who are not self-existent, but have been originated?"

He reminds his readers of the absurd representations which have been made of the gods, and, by copious references to the poets, exhibits the

impure loves of these deities. He then criticises the theory that these are only symbolical representations, and cites Thales and Plato in defence of his idea that the effects ascribed to the gods are produced by demons. The latter he identifies with the giants begotten by an unholy union between fallen angels and the daughters of men. The demons allure men to the worship of images, and practise various devices upon them. The heathen gods, he affirms, are simply men, and proves his affirmation from the poets.

In the last seven chapters he confutes the other charges against the Christians, setting forth in opposition to these charges their pure morals and humane temper. "For our account," he says, "lies not with human laws, which a bad man can evade, . . . but we have a law which makes the measure of rectitude to consist in dealing with our neighbor as ourselves."

The Apology closes with the temperate and altogether admirable appeal: —

"And now do you, who are entirely in everything, by nature and by education, upright, and moderate, and benevolent, and worthy of your rule, now that I have disposed of the several accusations, and proved that we are pious, and gentle, and temperate in spirit, bend your royal head in approval. For who are more deserving to obtain the things they ask than those who, like us, pray for your government, that you may, as is most equitable, receive the kingdom, son from father, and that your

empire may receive increase and addition, all men becoming subject to your sway? And this is also for our advantage, that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life, and may ourselves readily perform all that is commanded us."

There is a trace of ascetism in this writing, which appears especially in the author's treatment of second marriages. On this matter he says: "For he who deprives himself of his first wife, even though she be dead, is a cloaked adulterer, resisting the hand of God, because in the beginning God made one man and one woman." His idea of inspiration appears in the following sentences: "It would be irrational for us to cease to believe in the Spirit from God, who moved the mouths of the prophets like musical instruments, and to give heed to mere human opinions." Moses and Isaiah and Jeremiah, and the other prophets, were "lifted in ecstasy above the natural operations of their minds by the impulses of the Divine Spirit, [and] uttered the things with which they were inspired, the Spirit making use of them as a flute-player breathes into a flute."

In his idea of the Logos Athenagoras anticipates Origen's doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son. "He [the Son] is the first product of the Father, not as having been brought into existence, [for] from the beginning, God who is the eternal mind [*νοῦς*], had the Logos in Himself, being from eternity instinct with Logos [*λογικός*]."

"The Holy Spirit" he asserts "to be an effluence of God, flowing from Him, and returning back again like a beam of the sun."

The limits of present space make it necessary for me to leave the consideration of Irenæus until the next lecture, where he more properly belongs, since his writings which have come down to us are chiefly against heresies. Clement of Alexandria and Origen will be considered in the lecture on the Christian school of Alexandria. Of the other apologists belonging to the first three centuries, Quadratus survives in a single fragment; the works of Aristides are wholly lost; and the writings of Melito of Sardis exist in only a few fragments, an apology in Syriac ascribed to him probably not being by his hand. The apology by Theophilus, "To Autolycus," which was written a little after the middle of the second century, and is a work showing profound acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures and ably exhibiting their superiority to the heathen writings, must be passed by, as also must Methodius, and the learned and powerful Hippolytus.

Of the Latin apologists, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Arnobius, and Lactantius, whom I have named in their chronological order, I can present briefly only one, Tertullian. Minucius Felix wrote his "Octavius" a little after 200 A. D. Of this work the late Dean Milman said, "Perhaps no late work, either Pagan or Christian, reminds us of

the golden days of Latin prose so much as the 'Octavius' of Minucius Felix." The work of Lactantius belongs to the early years of the fourth century, and is characterized by great dignity, elegance, and clearness of style, and by varied and extensive erudition; it was justly much esteemed by the Fathers of the Church.

TERTULLIAN, whose full name was Quintus Florens Tertullianus, was born in Carthage, of heathen parentage, in the year 160, or a little earlier. His father was a centurion in the service of the proconsul, with sufficient means to give his boy a liberal education. Carthage was at that time one of the main seats of learning in the Roman empire. Tertullian, a lad of brilliant promise, made rapid progress in his studies. He mastered Greek so that he could both speak and write it with ease.

He knew his Homer and other poets, and was widely read in philosophy, science, and history. For the latter studies he evidently cared more than he did for poetry. Like most heathens of his time, he spent his youth in dissipation, a course of life which was almost inevitable to one of his station, in a city abounding in vices, especially sensuality of the fiercer types. His descriptions, in later life, of scenes in the theatre and arena and other resorts of pleasure, were evidently drawn from personal observation and experience. Yet, despite the wildness of his early years, he read much and developed to a high de-

gree his powers both of reasoning and expression. A born orator, his very endowments led him to embrace the profession of a pleader, or advocate. It is possible that he was destined for official life in the State. He seems to have practised as a jurist in Rome sometime during the reign of Commodus (180–192), and is the reputed author of two legal works. His legal training is apparent in his writings, not only in his general style, which is juridical rather than homiletic, but also in his skill in argument and his frequent use of legal terms. In his apologies he is the trained and passionate advocate and defender, rather than the calm and critical apologist.

Between 190 and 195, probably in 192, he became a convert to Christianity. He at once threw himself ardently into the study of the Bible and Christian literature, and very soon began to use his pen in defence of Christians and the Christian faith. He appears to have written somewhat in Greek, but most of his work was in Latin. His Greek writings are entirely lost. He was made a presbyter in Carthage, where his life mainly was spent. That he was married we know from letters addressed to his wife which appear among his published works.

In 202 or 203 he espoused Montanism. Montanus, of whom I shall have more to say later, was a Phrygian Christian who was a believer in the immediate and continuous inspiration of all Christians, a Puritan in morals, who disparaged

wedlock and exalted celibacy, emphasized the importance of fasting, and took the severest views of Christians who, in violation of their baptismal vows, fell into sin. Tertullian continued to write with vigor and boldness in defence of the Christian faith and to denounce persecution; but in 207 he broke entirely with the Catholic Church and became the head of the Montanist party in Africa, as Tatian had become the head of the Encratites in Syria. This party of Montanists, known as "Tertullianists," continued in existence down to the fifth century. Tertullian was led to adopt Montanist principles by the laxity of the clergy in Carthage, but also by the tendency of his temperament to a stricter life. In 207 he wrote an elaborate polemic against Marcion, the Gnostic. His writings as a Montanist are full of attacks upon the laxity of Catholics. The date of his death is unknown. Jerome says that he lived to "a decrepit age;" he died probably in 240.

Tertullian was the first of the Latin Fathers, and the greatest, previous to Augustine. He was the creator of Latin Christian literature, fashioning out of the rude Punic Latin a powerful, if not always elegant, vehicle for his thought. His writings show his wide and varied knowledge and interests. They are a treasury of facts illustrative both of the heathen life of his time and of the doctrines and worship of the Church. Of his Montanist writings, Bishop Kaye says, that they "are among the most

valuable, simply because, in his unsparing attacks on what he held to be faulty in the practices and discipline of the Church, he unconsciously preserves for our information what these were."

His literary activity extended from 197, or a little earlier, to 223. His writings are of greater extent than the extant writings of any other ante-Nicene writer, with the exception of Origen, filling four large octavo volumes. They have been divided into (*a*) Apologetic, (*b*) Dogmatic and Polemical, and (*c*) Moral and Ascetic. In temperament he was impetuous, vehement, eloquent, and fearless. Says Moeller, "His was a fiery nature, rich in fantasy, witty and passionate and inclined to paradox, at the same time endowed with a certain amount of Oriental (Punic) warmth and sensuousness, but also with a good share of Roman sense of what is solid and effective." He bears a certain resemblance to Tatian. Both of these men recoiled violently from the immoralities and obscenities of pagan religions, both tended strongly toward ascetism, both had the courage of their convictions, and both were entirely consecrated to their faith. Tertullian's apologies, like Tatian's, are polemic and aggressive, abounding in trenchant and often scornful invective. Tatian has been called "The Assyrian Tertullian." Altogether, Tertullian was a genuine, though somewhat hot-headed, and sometimes wrong-headed, man, whose very faults add a certain attractiveness to his personality.

His writings have been described as alike "rich in thought and destitute of form, passionate and hair-splitting, eloquent and pithy in expression, energetic and condensed to the point of obscurity." Says Harnack: —

"His style has been characterized with justice as dark and resplendent like ebony. His eloquence was of the vehement order; but it wins hearers and readers by the strength of its passion, the energy of its truth, the pregnancy and elegance of its expression, just as much as it repels them by its heat without light, its sophistical argumentations, and its elaborate hair-splittings. Though he is wanting in moderation and luminous warmth, his tones are by no means always harsh; and as an author he ever aspired with longing after humility and love and patience, though his whole life was lived in the atmosphere of conflict. Tertullian, both as a man and as a writer had much in common with the apostle Paul."

As a specimen of Tertullian's vehement spirit and style, I quote a part of chapter xxx. of his work entitled "De Spectaculis," written in denunciation of the popular exhibitions in the circus:

"What a spectacle is that fast-approaching advent of our Lord, now owned by all, now highly exalted, now a triumphant One! What that exultation of the angelic hosts! what the glory of the rising saints! what the kingdom of the just thereafter! what the city New Jerusalem! Yes, and there are other sights: that last day of judgment, with its everlasting issues; that day unlooked for

by the nations, the theme of their derision, when the world, hoary with age, and all its many products shall be consumed in one great flame! How vast a spectacle then bursts upon the eye! What there excites my admiration? what my derision? Which sight gives me joy? which rouses me to exultation?—as I see so many illustrious monarchs, whose reception into the heavens was publicly announced, groaning now in the lowest darkness with great Jove himself, and those, too, who bore witness of their exaltation; governors of provinces, too, who persecuted the Christian name, in fires more fierce than those with which in the days of their pride they raged against the followers of Christ! What world's wise men besides, the very philosophers, in fact, who taught their followers that God had no concern in aught that is sublunary, and were wont to assure them that either they had no souls, or that they would never return to the bodies which at death they had left, now covered with shame before the poor deluded ones, as one fire consumes them! Poets also, trembling not before the judgment-seat of Rhadamanthus or Minos, but of the unexpected Christ! I shall have a better opportunity then of hearing the tragedians, louder-voiced in their own calamity; of viewing the play-actors, much more 'dissolute' in the dissolving flame; of looking upon the charioteer, all glowing in his chariot of fire; of witnessing wrestlers, not in their gymnasia, but tossing in the fiery billows; unless even then I shall not care to attend to such ministers of sin, in my eager wish rather to fix a gaze insatiable on those whose fury vented itself against the Lord. 'This,' I shall say, 'this is that carpenter's or harlot's son, that Sabbath-breaker, that Samaritan and devil-possessed! This is

He whom you purchased from Judas! This is He whom you struck with reed and fist, whom you contemptuously spat upon, to whom you gave gall and vinegar to drink! This is He whom His disciples secretly stole away, that it might be said He had risen again, or the gardener abstracted, that his lettuces might come to no harm from the crowds of visitants!' What quæstor or priest in his munificence will bestow on you the favor of seeing and exulting in such things as these? and yet even now we in a measure have them by faith in the picturings of imagination."

It is interesting to know that he who wrote these appalling sentences could also write the following description of patience: —

"Her face is tranquil and serene, her forehead pure, and unfurrowed by one line of sadness or anger; her eyebrows are slightly raised in token of joy: she droops her eyes, not in sorrow but in humility; a dignified silence seals her lips, the hue of her countenance is that of innocence and security. She defies the devil, and he trembles at her smile. White is the robe which falls across her breast and enwraps her form; it neither heaves nor throbs tumultuously. She is seated on the throne of a mind full of quietness and peace, which is ruffled by no storm, shadowed by no cloud, which is like the calm and open heaven of blue, which Elias saw in his third vision."

And could utter these words on penitence: —

"Penitence is our life, for it is the great antidote of death. O sinner, such a one as I am, or rather less guilty than I, who am myself the chief of sinners, embrace

repentance, cling to it as the shipwrecked man clings to the plank which saves him. It will raise thee above those floods of sin which engulf thee, and will bring thee into the port of Divine mercy."

Tertullian wrote his apologies in a time of fierce and violent persecutions, in which all the old charges were revived against the Christians. These persecutions were often caused by popular hate or fanaticism, but in Africa they seem as the rule, to have been directed, or at least abetted, by the Roman officials. "From the 'Ad Martyres' to the 'Ad Scapulam,' from the first to the last of those impassioned and pathetic utterances which appeal, not for mercy but for justice, not for forgiveness for latent vice, but for praise for open virtue, not for pardon for mistaken treason, but for recognition of the truest patriotism, not for the condonation of 'atheism' but for salutation of a God-given faith, — the tale is told of dire suffering divinely borne, of martyrs and confessors who had taken up the Cross and were faithful unto death."

In 197–198 Tertullian wrote five apologetic works: "To the Martyrs," "Apology," "On the Testimony of the Soul," "To the Nations," and "Against the Jews." Of these I can notice briefly only three.

"To the Martyrs," probably his earliest Christian writing, was addressed to Christians in prison in the year 197. It begins with an allusion to the care taken by the Church for their material needs: —

"Blessed Martyrs Designate, — Along with the provision which our lady mother the Church from her bountiful breasts, and each brother out of his private means, makes for your bodily wants in the prison, accept also from me some contribution to your spiritual sustenance. For it is not good that the flesh be feasted and the spirit starve."

He exhorts them to steadfastness in concord, amidst the temptations which come to them in their very trial : —

"Give not [the wicked one] the success in his own kingdom [*i. e.*, the prison] of setting you at variance with each other, but let him find you armed and fortified with concord ; for peace among you is battle with him." The world is more a prison than the confinement into which they have gone. "If we reflect," he says, "that the world is more really the prison, we shall see that you have gone out of a prison rather than into one. The world has the greater darkness, blinding men's hearts. The world imposes the more grievous fetters, binding men's very souls."

He shows that the spirit may gain more in a prison than the flesh loses. "You have no occasion," he reminds them, "to look on strange gods, you do not run against their images; you have no part in heathen holidays, even by mere bodily mingling in them; you are not annoyed by the foul fumes of idolatrous solemnities; you are not pained by the noise of the public shows, nor

by the atrocity or madness or immodesty of their celebrants." "Let us drop the name of prison," he continues; "let us call it a place of retirement. Though the body is shut in, though the flesh is confined, all things are open to the spirit. In spirit, then, roam abroad; in spirit walk about, not setting before you shady paths or colonnades, but the way which leads to God. As often as in spirit your footsteps are there, so often you will not be in bonds. The leg does not feel the chain when the mind is in the heavens." He recalls to their minds the discipline by which soldiers inure themselves for the toils and perils of the campaign, and exclaims: "In like manner, O blessed, count whatever is hard in this lot of yours as a discipline of your powers of mind and body." So also, he reminds them, athletes are severely trained. Then he encourages the Christian prisoners to endurance by examples of pagan self-sacrifice and fortitude, telling them that if they fear to suffer they will be confounded by those who out of vanity have sought pain and death.

The "Apology" was written a little later, probably in the latter part of 198. Fresh and violent persecution had broken out against the Christians. The "Apology," "the greatest of Tertullian's works," was a passionate and powerfully reasoned demand for bare justice. It begins by boldly denouncing the Gentile hatred of the Christians as outrageously unjust. Tertullian is in no deprecatory mood.

"We enter not upon defence in the popular way," he exclaims, "by begging your favor, and moving your compassion, because we know the state of our religion too well to wonder at our usage. The truth we profess, we know to be a stranger upon earth, and she expects not friends in a strange land; but she came from heaven, and her abode is there, and there are all our hopes, all our friends, and all our preferments. . . . What can the laws suffer in their authority by admitting [this heavenly stranger] to a full hearing? Will not their power rise in glory for the justice of the hearing? But if you condemn her unheard, besides the odium of flaming injustice, you will deservedly incur the suspicion of being conscious of something that makes you so unwilling to hear, — what, when heard, you cannot condemn."[1]

That the persecutors are ignorant of Christianity is no excuse, but rather an aggravation of their injustice. Tertullian arraigns the judges both for malice and perverseness. He argues that human laws may err, and therefore may be amended, and cites well-known cases of revision. The laws against Christians being manifestly unjust, if these laws are found not to be according to the standard of justice, they are deservedly condemned; and, "if they punish for a mere name, they are not only to be exploded for their iniquity, but to be hissed off the world for their folly."

[1] The translation of "The Apology" used here is that of Rev. William Reeve, M. A, who was rector of Cranford, Middlesex, England, 1694–1726. The English of this translation is slightly archaic, but it is racy, and, in the main, true to the sense of the original.

The emperors who have persecuted the Christians, he claims, were the worst men; like Nero, who "could hate nothing exceedingly but what was exceedingly good," and like Domitian, "a limb of this bloody Nero;" while the best emperors, like Marcus Aurelius, have protected the Christians. This passage would indicate Tertullian's belief that the persecutions which took place in Gaul and in other parts of the empire, during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, were not executed by the command, or with the consent, of the emperor, but were the result solely of popular enmity. The facts, however, indicate that this belief was not well-founded. Against those who urged on persecution of the Christians because Christianity was a novelty, and who were "such mighty sticklers for the observation of old laws," he contends that they had themselves introduced many novelties. He cites certain sumptuary laws, for example, those —

"which allowed not above a noble (100 asses, a little more than 100 cents of our money, but, allowing for the difference in value between that time and the present, perhaps about $10) for an entertainment, and but one hen, and that not a crammed one, for a supper; . . . which excluded a senator from the senate-house, as a man of ambitious designs, for having but ten pound weight of silver plate in his family; which levelled the rising theatres to the ground immediately, as seminaries only of lewdness and immorality."

These laws they had themselves egregiously vio-

lated. Some expended 100 sestertia (about $4,000, or, allowing for the difference in value, about $40,000) for a single meal; others had "mines of silver melted into dishes" for the tables of freedmen. Theatres abound. The women are given up to luxury and wantonness. In all this the persecutors are themselves guilty, both of violating the laws, and of abandoning their ancestral religion. How absurd, therefore, is their charge against the Christians of introducing novelties. Tertullian shows that the common rumor against the Christians is absolutely lacking the support of any evidence. The crimes charged against them are not only improbable, but even impossible; on the contrary, he proves "that the heathens are guilty both in the dark, and in the face of the sun, of acting the same abominations they charge upon Christians, and their own guiltiness, perhaps, is the very thing which disposes them to believe the like of others;" and that the heathen are notoriously guilty of offering evil sacrifices, of destroying infants, and of committing unnatural crimes. He reminds them that one way they had of discovering Christians was, requiring them to eat blood-pudding, which they would invariably refuse, because by their very principles it was forbidden them to taste blood. "If now, therefore," he exclaims, "you would turn your eyes inward, and see the guilt in yourselves, you would see innocence in us, for contraries are best seen together."

He maintains that the gods of the Gentiles are no gods, for they are but men, and he ridicules the worship of images. He charges the heathen with irreverence to their own gods, and with mocking them by offering the vilest parts of the sacrifices and by representing them on the stage, in comedies and tragedies, by lewd and infamous persons. In strong contrast he sets forth the Christian idea of God, and the involuntary tribute to Him which is often rendered by the heathen themselves, in their very exclamations: —

"'The great God,' 'the good God,' 'the God which is the giver of all good things,' are forms of speech in every one's mouth upon special occasions. This God is appealed to as the Judge of the world, by saying, 'God sees everything,' and 'I recommend myself to God,' and 'God will recompense me.' Oh! what are all these sayings but the writings of God upon the heart, but the testimonies of the soul thus far by nature Christian?"

Tertullian then relates the story of the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek in the Septuagint, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, and launches into an argument on the antiquity of those Scriptures, proving their divine authority by the fulfilment of the prophecies. From this point he proceeds to explain how it is that Christians worship the God of the Jews, and yet are antagonized by the Jews, while they are charged with worshipping a man. Christ, whom they worship, is the Logos,

who, issuing from the spiritual substance of God, is "both God and the Son of God, and those two are one." He gives a brief account of the birth and miracles and death and resurrection of Christ, and vindicates His true divinity.

"We say we are Christians, and say it to the whole world, under the hands of the executioner, and in the midst of all the tortures you exercise us with to unsay it. Torn and mangled and covered over in our own blood, we cry out as loud as we are able to cry that we are worshippers of God through Christ. Believe this Christ if you please, to be a man, but let me tell you He is the only man by whom and in whom God will be known and worshipped to advantage."

Having thus given an account of the origin and nature of the Christian religion, he devotes considerable space to a discussion of the power and methods of demons, whom he pronounces a degenerate race, springing "from a corrupted stock of angels." These are bent upon the ruin of mankind, and, in fulfilment of their malign purpose, they cause diseases, disasters, blight, and contagion; they blast the minds of men, stir up outrageous lusts, entice the soul to the worship of false gods, and take delight in the fumes of blood and the stench of burning flesh in the sacrifices. Their residence is in the air, and they have such swiftness that they are practically ubiquitous; yet they are subject to the command of Christians. He boldly

challenges a test: "Let a demoniac therefore be brought into court, and the spirit which possesses him be commanded by any Christian to declare what he is, he shall confess himself as truly to be a devil as he did falsely before profess himself a god." It is undeniable, therefore, he maintains, that the deities of the pagans are no deities. On the confession of evil spirits under the adjuration of Christians, he denounces the Romans as themselves proved guilty of irreligion. The Roman grandeur, he declares, is not due to the Roman religion, for God alone is the dispenser of kingdoms. He charges upon the Romans that they venerate their emperors more than they do the gods, and shows that, so far from the gods protecting the emperors, it is the emperors who maintain the gods. The Christians, even while suffering persecution, are ever mindful to pray for the life and prosperity of the emperors, and their prayers are of more avail than any sacrifice.

"Thus, then, while we are stretching forth our hands to our God, let your tormenting irons harrow our flesh; let your gibbets exalt us, or your fires lick up our bodies, or your swords cut off our heads, or your beasts tread us to earth. For a Christian upon his knees to his God is in a posture of defence against all the evils you can crowd upon him.

"Consider this, O you impartial judges, and go on with your justice, and while our soul is pouring out herself to God in the behalf of the emperor, do you be letting out her blood."

Christians pray for the emperors, not that their prayers may be looked upon as "spices of flattery," but because they are commanded to love their enemies, and because, by maintaining thus the prosperity of the empire, they retard "the conflagration of the universe which is now at hand, and is likely to flame out in the conclusion of this century."

He defends the loyalty of Christians in refusing to call the emperor God, and commends Augustus, the founder of the empire, for rejecting the title Dominus, or Lord. "Nevertheless," he adds, "I should not scruple to call the emperor lord; but then it must be when I am not compelled to do it in a sense peculiarly appropriated to God; for I am Cæsar's free-born subject, and we have but one Lord, the Almighty and Eternal God, who is his Lord as well as mine."

He contrasts the sober conduct of the Christians, on the occasion of the public festivals, with the "dissolute joy" of the heathen, and demands kinder treatment for "the Christian sect, . . . because it is a sect from whom nothing hostile ever comes, like the dreadful issue of other unlawful factions." He then describes at length the organization, worship, charities, and pure life of the Christians.

"We Christians," he says, "are a corporation or society of men most strictly united by the same religion, by the same rites of worship, and animated with one and the

same hope. When we come to the public service of God, we come in as formidable a body, as if we were to storm heaven by force of prayer, and such a force is a most grateful violence to God. . . . We meet together likewise for the reading of Holy Scriptures, and we take such lessons out of them as we judge suit best with the condition of the times, to confirm our faith either by forewarning us what we are to expect, or by bringing to our minds the predictions already fulfilled. . . . However, besides the bare reading, we continually preach and press the duties of the gospel with all the power and argument of which we are capable; for it is in these assemblies that we exhort, reprove, and pass the divine censure or sentence of excommunication. . . . The presidents or bishops among us are men of the most venerable age and piety, raised to this honor, not by the powers of money, but the brightness of their lives; for nothing sacred is to be had for money. That kind of treasury we have is not filled with any dishonorable sum, as the price of a purchased religion; every one puts a little to the public stock, commonly once a month, or when he pleases, and only upon condition that he is both willing and able; for there is no compulsion upon any. All here is a free-will offering, and all these collections are deposited in a common bank for charitable uses, not for the support of merry meetings, for drinking and gormandizing, but for feeding the poor and burying the dead, providing for girls and boys who have neither parents nor provisions left to support them, for relieving old people worn out in the service of the saints, or those who have suffered by shipwreck, or are condemned to the mines, or islands, or prisons, only for the faith of Christ; these may be said to live upon their

profession, for while they suffer for professing the name of Christ they are fed with the collections of His Church."

He then takes up the charge that Christians are the cause of public calamities, and shows that it is malicious and baseless as well as absurd; and points out the true cause in the impiety of their accusers. In answer to an indictment that they are a "good-for-nothing, useless sort of people," he proves the contrary, for among them are found no idlers or malefactors of any kind. The reason for their innocence is their law, which is more perfect and has stronger sanctions than the civil law.

"We who know we must account to a God who sees the secrets of all hearts, we who have a prospect of that eternal punishment He has in store for the transgressors of His laws, — we, I say, may well be looked upon, under so much revelation, to be the only men who always take innocence in their way."

Having thus replied in detail to every charge against the Christians, Tertullian turns his attention to the philosophers, and demonstrates that they have less right to toleration than the Christians; for if, as is said, "philosophers prescribe and profess the same doctrine as Christians, namely, innocence, justice, patience, temperance, and chastity," then Christians should be "equalled to those, in points of privilege and impunity, to whom [they] are compared in points of discipline." But many

of the philosophers are guilty of impiety to the gods, and of disrespect to the emperors; many of them affect truth only in appearance, and confessedly are guilty of various vices. Moreover, the poets and philosophers have stolen from the Sacred Scriptures whatever they could pervert to their own purposes: "All the arrows that are shot at truth are taken from her own quiver, for the heresies are to look with a gospel face in emulation of divine truth, and the spirits of error have a great stroke in the picture."

In the next chapter he argues for the literal resurrection of the body: —

"The graves then shall repay the bodies at the day of judgment, because it is not conceivable perhaps how a mere soul should be passible without a union with matter, I mean the flesh; but especially because the divine justice will have souls suffer in the bodies in which they have sinned. . . . The worshippers of God shall be clothed upon with a substance proper for everlasting duration, and fixed in a perpetual union with God; but the profane and the hypocrite shall be doomed to a lake of everflowing fire, and fueled with incorruptibility from the divine indefectible nature of that flame which torments them."

The apology closes with the characteristic claim of victory for the Christians; their triumph is only assured and hastened by persecution: —

"To set up truth is our victory, and the victor's glory is to please his God, and the precious spoil of that victory

is eternal life; and this life we certainly win by dying for it: therefore we conquer when we are killed, and being killed are out of reach of you and all other vexations forever. . . . And now, O worshipful judges, go on with your show of justice, and, believe me, you will be juster and juster still in the opinion of the people, the oftener you make them a sacrifice of Christians. Crucify, torture, condemn, grind us all to powder if you can; your injustice is an illustrious proof of our innocence, and for the proof of this it is that God permits us to suffer. . . . But do your worst, and rack your inventions for tortures for Christians — it is all to no purpose; you do but attract the world, and make it fall the more in love with our religion; the more you mow us down, the thicker we rise; the Christian blood you spill is like the seed you sow, it springs from the earth again, and fructifies the more."

Tertullian's idea of martyrdom, which soon became, if it had not already become, the prevalent idea in the African church, is apparent from these words: "Who ever looked well into our religion but came over to it? And who ever came over, but was ready to suffer for it, to purchase the favor of God, and obtain the pardon of all his sins, though at the price of his blood? for martyrdom is sure of mercy."

In his book, "Concerning the Testimony of the Soul," Tertullian thus interrogates the soul: "Stand forth, O soul, . . . and give thy witness;" and he finds it, not Christian indeed, since "man becomes a Christian, he is not born one," but, in

its natural and unsophisticated state, an involuntary witness to the fundamental truths of the Christian religion: the being of God, — "to whom the name of God alone belongs, from whom all things come, and who is Lord of the whole universe;" the existence and wickedness of the demons; and the judgment after death. But, in this involuntary testimony, the soul corroborates the Sacred Scriptures; it is therefore self-condemned.

He concludes: —

"Most justly, then, every soul is a culprit as well as a witness: in the measure that it testifies for truth, the guilt of error lies on it; and on the day of judgment it will stand before the courts of God, without a word to say. Thou proclaimedest God, O soul, but thou didst not seek to know Him; evil spirits were detested by thee, and yet they were the objects of thy adoration; the punishments of hell were foreseen by thee, but no care was taken to avoid them; thou hadst a savor of Christianity, and withal wert the persecutor of Christians."

This sketch of the Church's answer to the intellectual attack of heathenism is too brief to be adequate or even just; but perhaps it is sufficient to show the nature of that answer; its full scope can be seen only in the great work of Origen against Celsus.

During the past century, Christian apologetics has developed into a science which makes the apologetic work of the first three hundred years,

with the exception of that of Clement and Origen, seem slight in comparison; yet the early work was characterized by dignity, purity of moral tone, and often by much acuteness and strength of argument.

But then, as now, the great defence of Christianity was the character and life which the spirit and teaching of Christ naturally and inevitably produce; and these constitute also its chief appeal to the reason and conscience of men. Against this defence no argument can prevail; to this appeal the sincere heart must sooner or later yield a welcome.

THE STRUGGLE WITHIN THE CHURCH: HERESIES.

THE struggle of the Church with both the material and the intellectual forces of heathenism was accompanied by a struggle within itself against ideas which, finding lodgment in its bosom, threatened not only the integrity, but the very existence, of its faith. This was the struggle with heresies. In the strictly historical sense it is improper to speak of heresies before the formal utterances of the great Councils, at least before the Council of Nicæa. In the early Church within the sphere of interpretation of Scripture and inference from its teachings, there was great freedom, and there were many variations in belief. There was no authoritative standard of orthodoxy, save that which was afforded by the New Testament. Heresy, therefore, as applied to beliefs in that early time, has a different signification from that which it acquired later. The term designates tendencies and types of thought that were destructive or perversive of the fundamental Christian facts and truths. The Fathers used the word "heresy" to designate ideas, whether Jewish or pagan, that "impinged upon and imperilled the true faith in Jesus Christ."

Half-unconsciously, but with an unconquerable instinct for the simple realities of the gospel, the Church began its fight, both with the survivals of late Judaism, and with the speculative tendencies of heathenism that subtly intruded themselves into the Church by allying themselves with Christianity, adopting its phrases, and claiming its authority. This subtle intrusion was especially characteristic of that multifarious form of thought termed Gnosticism. The Church rested on a basis of facts; Gnosticism, on pure speculation. An early outcome of the struggle was, substantially, the "Apostles' Creed."

This ancient symbol, which, in its present form, belongs to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, is really earlier than the Nicene Creed; for all the articles of the former were in existence long before the conflict between Arius and Athanasius resulted in the formation of the Nicene symbol. The Apostles' Creed had its origin, probably, in the primitive baptismal confession. As a whole, it is eminent as being peculiarly a confession of facts rather than of principles. This old factual creed is a witness of the historical basis of Christianity, as opposed to a mythological or speculative basis. In it the Church affirmed, with clear simplicity, its faith in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in Christ, the Son of Mary and Son of God, who truly was born, lived, taught, suffered, died and was buried, and rose again.

Simple as was this faith, and strongly as it was attested by a continuous line of witnesses from the apostles down, it was maintained by the Church only as the result of a prolonged and determined conflict. The time was astir with speculation. Even as early as the days of St. Paul Gnosticism was "in the air," — an evidence of which we may find, perhaps, in the apostle's half-scornful expression, "Knowledge (γνῶσις) puffs up; love builds up," — but it did not come into distinct shape until near the middle of the second century. Judaistic heresies were rife for a time, but like Jewish persecution of Christians compared with pagan persecution, they were of far less significance and power than the Gentile heresies. The latter all fall under the general name Gnosticism, — unless we except Manichæism, which was a mixture of ideas from India and Persia, with a slight infusion of Christian ideas. Even Manichæism, however, had certain decidedly Gnostic elements.

In the East, Christian thinkers were profoundly influenced by Plato, and this influence was especially strong in Alexandria, where Platonism received from Philo a Jewish cast. In the West, the church was characterized by a more practical spirit, and its great leaders turned their attention rather to the development of ecclesiastical organization and adminstration, than to the elaboration of doctrines. Gnosticism had a much stronger hold in the East, therefore, than in the West.

Gnosticism was essentially eclectic. From Hellenism it derived its intellectual spirit, as its very name indicates; from Orientalism it derived its pantheistic conception of the world and also its dualism; and from Christianity it derived the idea of redemption. Some forms of Gnosticism, like that of Marcion, were violently antagonistic to Judaism. Other forms, like that of Basilides, were sympathetic toward Judaism. All forms of Gnosticism were docetic; they evaporated the facts of the gospel history into myths and symbols. All forms of Gnosticism were also dualistic, and they identified evil with matter. The great questions considered by the Gnostics concerned the origin of the world and of matter, the nature and destiny of man, and the nature of evil and how it is to be escaped. In the Gnostic thought there is an infinite separation between the Supreme Being and the world, and a necessity, therefore, of positing mediating powers for creation as well as redemption. The God of the Old Testament was conceived, not as the Supreme Being, but as a subordinate Deity, who created the heavens and the earth. The void between the Supreme Being, who is the Ineffable One of whom no attributes can be predicated, and the lowest forms of being, is filled by Æons, — personified attributes. "In all its forms Gnosticism may be said to represent the efforts made by the speculative spirit of the time to appropriate Christianity, and to make use

of some of its most fertile principles for the solution of the mysteries lying at the root of human speculation."

It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, accurately and exhaustively to define Gnosticism, and very nearly as difficult sharply to distinguish the various Gnostic sects from each other. These may be divided into the Judaistic and the anti-Judaistic, with Neander; or the ascetic and licentious, with Clement of Alexandria; or those which were hostile to both Judaism and heathenism, and those that saw something of the truth in both Judaism and heathenism, with Baur; or Alexandrian (by which term is designated the sects that were predominantly influenced by the Platonic philosophy) and Syrian (by which term is designated the sects that were predominantly influenced by Parsism) with Giesseler. Two of these classifications, those of Neander and Giesseler, are practically identical, for Judaistic Gnosticism had its chief seat in Alexandria, where the Jewish Neoplatonism of Philo was rife, and anti-Judaistic Gnosticism had its seat chiefly in Syria. Some of the sects were ascetic and rigorously suppressed the flesh, while others were openly licentious, indulging the flesh because the soul, being wholly foreign to the flesh, could not be affected by it.

The Gnostic idea of redemption is that of a release or disentanglement of the soul from matter in which it is imprisoned. All the systems of

Gnostic thought agree in attaching critical importance to the coming of Christ, but the redemption which Christ achieves is solely by the impartation of knowledge and the disclosure of mysteries. Some held that Jesus was a mere man, who was the bearer of a revelation. Others held that He was not man at all, and His bodily manifestation, His sufferings, and His death, were but deceptive appearances. Still others held that He had a double personality: He was a real man inhabited temporarily by a messenger from the unseen world, who came in the form of a dove at His baptism, and departed at the time of His crucifixion.

As the pagan heresies may all be loosely grouped under the term Gnosticism, so the Jewish heresies may all be grouped under the term Ebionism. Of the latter there were several varieties. The Ebionites proper, whose name is derived from "ebion," meaning "poor" (with reference to the voluntary poverty of the sect, or as a term of reproach applied to the Jewish Christians generally by non-Christian Jews), held to Christianity as only a slightly modified Judaism, of which it was the continuation and supplement. They exalted the Old Covenant at the expense of the New, found their ideal of life in a perfect legal righteousness, and looked for the restoration of Jerusalem in the coming millennial reign of the Messiah. Jesus, they claimed, was the son of Joseph and Mary, and, previous to His baptism,

merely a descendant of David. At his baptism He became Christ and Messiah, who, in the future, is to return and restore all things. They maintained the necessity of observing the law by all who would be saved, refused hospitality to Gentiles, and claimed that Jesus was the Christ of God because he perfectly fulfilled the law. If any one else were perfectly to fulfil the law he also would be a Christ. They violently hated the apostle Paul, and, while not denying the authenticity of his epistles, rejected them as the work of "an apostate from the law." They used a recension of Matthew's gospel, which was a Chaldee version written in Hebrew letters, from which the account of the supernatural origin of Jesus was omitted. In these Ebionites we recognize prominent features of the Judaizing troublers of St. Paul in Asia Minor.

The Essenian Ebionites were tinctured with Gnosticism. These rejected all the Old Testament writings except the Pentateuch, from which they eliminated whatever was not in accord with their principles. They held that God appointed two antagonistic powers,— Christ and the devil. The present world belongs to the devil, and the world to come belongs to Christ. Christ was created a Spirit by the Father, and had His first incarnation in Adam. At last He had come in Jesus. Jesus they held to be the successor of Moses and of no higher authority, but they admitted His miraculous origin.

They also were ascetic, refusing to eat flesh. They observed the Lord's day as well as the Sabbath, discarded sacrifices and reverence for the temple, and, contrary to the ascetic principle, honored marriage; but they detested St. Paul, rejected his epistles, and declined all fellowship with the uncircumcised. Once each year they observed the Lord's Supper, using unleavened bread and water. Unlike the Ebionites proper, they sought to make converts, and produced some literature.

There were also Ebionitic sects, such as the Nazarenes, who were more moderate in their views than the preceding. They did not demand that the Gentile Christians should observe the Jewish ceremonies, and they recognized St. Paul as a teacher for the Gentiles. But Ebionism was transient, and its influence on the whole, at least after apostolic times, was not great. It survived in a few adherents until about the middle of the fifth century.

Gnosticism appears in such multifarious forms, and is so wanting in definiteness and coherence as a system of thought, that I can present it most intelligibly by sketching in succession the lives and teachings of its principal representatives, without attempting any distinct classification. All forms of Gnosticism agree in certain pretty well defined principles. These are: the infinite remoteness of the Supreme Being; the absolute evil of matter; and redemption, or escape from entanglement with matter, by means of *gnosis*, or

occult knowledge. These principles are differently embodied and differently emphasized by different Gnostic teachers. The method of all is characterized by an extraordinary use of allegorism and symbolism. In discussing Gnostic theories we are dealing all the time, not at all with facts, nor even with ideas, so much as with fantasies. From these the Gnostic ideas must be extracted.

Among the very first of the Gnostics known to Christian history is SIMON MAGUS, of whom we have a glimpse in the Acts of the Apostles, but about whom there is such a cloud of legend and fable that it is difficult to extract therefrom any distinct personality or definite teaching. Simon Magus is commonly classed as a Gnostic, and, if he is properly identified with the Simon who figures in the criticism of Gnosticism by Irenæus and others, he undoubtedly did appropriate certain Gnostic ideas. It is apparent that he neither understood Christianity, nor to any extent came under its influence. The story of his conversion by St. Peter, reported in the Acts of the Apostles, shows us that his professed conversion was a sham.

He was a native of Gitta, in Samaria, and was a magician rather than a philosopher. His scheme included the idea of male and female principles in the Supreme Being, and the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. These ideas were already current, and he had the cleverness to adopt them and turn them to his own uses. Irenæus tells us

that he represented himself as "the Being who is the Father over all." He carried about with him a certain Helena, a prostitute whom he had redeemed from slavery at Tyre. This woman Simon declared to be "the first conception of his mind, the mother of all, by whom, in the beginning, he conceived in his mind [the thought] of forming angels and archangels." This "Ennœa," as she is called, "leaping forth from him, and comprehending the will of her Father, descended to the lower regions [of space], and generated angels and powers." These angels and powers were the creators of this world. After "Ennœa" had produced these, "she was detained by them through motives of jealousy, because they were unwilling to be looked upon as the progeny of any other being." Of himself, Simon affirmed, they had no knowledge whatever.

"Ennœa" suffered much from her captors, and was "shut up in a human body, and for ages passed in succession from one female body to another, as from vessel to vessel." She was, for example, the famous Helen of Troy. At last she appeared as a common prostitute, and it was she whom Jesus meant by the lost sheep in His parable.

To free her from bondage, and to set right the disorder of the world caused by the angels, and to save men by making himself known to them, Simon, though not a man, had appeared among men as a man. He it was "who appeared among the Jews as the Son, but descended in Samaria as

the Father, while he came to other nations in the character of the Holy Spirit." He was thought to have suffered in Judea, but this was an error. The prophets, he maintained, "uttered their predictions under the inspiration of those angels who formed the world." They were therefore no longer to be regarded. Men were to be "saved through his grace, and not on account of their own righteous actions." His followers were at liberty to live as they pleased. In the system of Simon, Hellena is the Gnostic Sophia.

His followers led profligate lives and practised magical arts, using exorcism, incantations, love-potions and charms. "He was," says Tulloch, "plainly an impostor of the first magnitude, who must be credited with a marvellous and unblushing audacity rather than with any clear philosophic or spiritual aims."

Simon was succeeded by a disciple named MENANDER, also a Samaritan, who like his master practised magic. Menander did not claim to be the chief power, but did claim to be a Saviour. Disciples, baptized in his own name, he said, would receive a resurrection and would neither die nor grow old, but abide in immortal youth.

One of the earliest Gnostics was CERINTHUS, a traditional contemporary and opponent of St. John. He was of Egyptian origin, in religion a

Jew, and was educated in the Judæo-Philonic school of Alexandria. On leaving Egypt he visited Jerusalem, Cæsarea, and Antioch; thence he passed into Asia Minor and made his headquarters in Galatia. A story survives of his meeting with St. John in the public baths in Ephesus. The apostle, hearing who was there, fled from the place as if for life, crying to those about him: "Let us flee, lest the bath fall in while Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is there."

We cannot place much confidence in the traditions on which this brief account of Cerinthus is based. He, rather than Simon Magus, seems to have been the earliest teacher of Jewish-Christian Gnosticism. He made no claim for himself of sacred and mystic power, but pretended to have received angelic revelations. Having been trained in the school of Philo, he did not hold to a malignant opposition between matter and spirit. According to him the world was created, not by "the First God," but by inferior angelic Beings. The God of the Jews he identified with the Angel who delivered the Law.

Cerinthus' view of Christ is Ebionitic: Christ was the Personality on whom the Holy Spirit descended to enable Him to perform miracles, but the Spirit flew heavenward when Christ came to His sufferings. Cerinthus believed that "the Lord shall have an earthly kingdom in which the elect are to enjoy pleasures, feasts, marriages, and

sacrifices. The capital of this kingdom is Jerusalem, and its duration one thousand years; at the end of that period shall ensue the restoration of all things." This notion he undoubtedly derived from Jewish sources. He held that if a man died unbaptized, another should be baptized in his place, in order that, at the resurrection, he might not suffer punishment. He also held that the words of Moses, and those of the prophets, were inspired by different angels, and he insisted on the practice of circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath.

There is a curious and somewhat early belief that Cerinthus was the author of the Apocalypse, which he ascribed to St. John in order to obtain credit and currency for his forgery. The followers of Cerinthus soon disappeared, some relapsing into stricter Ebionism, but the majority being absorbed into other Gnostic sects.

SATURNINUS, who, according to Irenæus, derived his doctrine from Simon Magus and Menander, taught in Syrian Antioch in the first half of the second century. He held that the Father, who is unknown to all, created Angels, Archangels, Powers and Authorities, but that the world and man were made by seven angels. These angels saw a brilliant image descend from the Supreme Power, and tried to detain it, but they could not; so they said, "Let us make man after the image and after the likeness." The man, when created,

could not stand erect, but grovelled like a wrigling worm. Then the Upper Power in compassion sent a spark of life which raised the man and made him live. At his death this spark returns to its source, and the rest of the man is resolved back into its original elements. This creation-myth was substantially held also by the Ophites.

Saturninus taught that the God of the Jews was one of the seven angels. These were in constant warfare with Satan and a company of evil angels. There were also two kinds of men, the good and the bad. The evil angels aided the bad men in their strife with the good. At last the Supreme Being sent a Saviour to destroy, inconsistently enough, the power of the God of the Jews and the creator-angels, and to save the good men. This Saviour was a man only in appearance. Here we have the characteristic Gnostic docetism, and its doctrines that evil has its source in the creation of matter and that redemption is by escape from matter. Some of the Jewish prophecies Saturninus ascribed to Satan, and some to the creator-angels. He also taught that marriage came from Satan. Many of his disciples followed him strictly in this teaching, and also abstained from animal food of all kinds, attracting admiring followers by their severity of life. Saturninus left no writings.

To the same time belongs CERDO, who came to Rome from Syria in 135, or a little later. He

seems to have held to two first principles and two gods, one good and the other evil, the latter the creator of the world; though another account ascribes to him the teaching that the God revealed in the law and the prophets was not the Father of Jesus Christ, for the former was only just, but the latter was good. The accounts are conflicting; and, as Cerdo left no writings, it is impossible to determine his exact doctrines. He seems to have had no intention of forming a sect, but to have frequented the churches, promulgating his ideas both publicly and privately. His followers were soon after merged in the school of Marcion.

CARPOCRATES was a Platonic philosopher, who taught in Alexandria, also in the early part of the second century, probably during the reign of Hadrian. He incorporated Christian elements into his system, and became the founder of an heretical sect. He taught that different angels and powers emanated from the One Unknown and Ineffable God, and the lowest of these created the world. Good souls escape from these, and rule them, by magical arts, and finally ascend to God who is above them.

Jesus was only a man, but was superior to other men in that His soul, remaining steadfast and pure, remembered the revelations which it had seen before it issued from God, and therefore had power to escape the makers of the world. He despised

the Jewish customs, and consequently was able to destroy the passions which are given to men as a punishment. Others might be equal or superior to Jesus if they also despised the rulers of the world.

Carpocrates adopted from Plato his idea of reminiscence: human knowledge is but the recollection of what had been seen in a pre-existent state. His followers had pictures and images of Christ which they honored, but they paid the same honors to philosophers, such as Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle. They illustrated their contempt for the rulers of the world by practising immorality without scruple and without restraint. They held that "things in themselves were indifferent; nothing was in its own nature good or evil, and was only made so by human opinion. The true Gnostic might practise everything, — nay, it was his duty to have experience of all." They also adopted a form of the doctrine of the transmigration of souls: souls which had completed their experience passed up into fellowship with God; those which had not were sent back to inhabit other bodies for further discipline; finally all would be saved. Salvation, however, pertained only to the soul; there would be no resurrection of the body.

Carpocrates claimed to have the true teaching of Christ, which had been communicated to the disciples in secret and by them was passed on to

the faithful. His followers became proverbial for their deliberate licentiousness; and the Christians believed that the reports which were circulated among the heathen, of shameless orgies practised by the Christians in their love-feasts, had a basis of truth in the customs of the Carpocratians. It is said that the Carpocratians had a secret bodily mark by which they knew each other. A part of their baptismal ceremony was branding the back of the right ear-lobe. This act represented the "baptism with fire." They also practised magic, claiming miraculous powers equal to those of Christ. A son of Carpocrates, who was associated with his father in propagating his doctrines, but who died early in life, is said to have been deified and worshipped by the inhabitants of his mother's native town in Cephalonia.

A contemporary of Carpocrates was BASILIDES, the founder of a Christian-Gnostic sect in Egypt. He claimed to be a disciple of one Glaucias, an alleged interpreter of St. Peter. According to Irenæus he, like Saturninus, derived his doctrines from Simon Magus and Menander. This can scarcely be true, however, for what little system of thought Simon Magus had is radically different from that of Basilides. Basilides was probably a native of Syria. Little is known of his life, save that it was spent mainly in Alexandria, and that he wrote twenty-four books on the Gospel, — the

"Exegetica." Origen says that he "had the audacity to write a 'Gospel according to Basilides.'" This may have been one of the numerous apocryphal gospels, the production of which began in the second century and continued for several centuries. It is possible however, that it was simply a portion of the "Exegetica." Various fragments of the "Exegetica" have been collected by Grabe and others. The teachings of Basilides have been preserved to us in the writings of Irenæus and Clement, and especially Hippolytus. The last is much more full than either of the others, and, with an occasional contribution from Clement, must be mainly relied on.

The system of Basilides is bewildering in its vagueness and transcendentalism. It is distinguished by the unusual course, for a Gnostic, of discarding the emanation theory, or downward evolution, and predicating instantaneous creation and evolution upwards. All things, according to Basilides, arise from pure nothing. By this primeval nothing, or "not-being God" (*οὐκ ὢν θεός*), of which absolutely nothing can be predicated, was produced a non-existent and non-differentiated "Seed-world," which contained the germs of all future growths. Both Creator and created, however, were non-existent. "Whatsoever I affirm," says Basilides, "to have been made after these, ask no question as to whence. For [the Seed] had all seeds treasured and reposing in itself, as

non-existent entities, which were designed to be produced by the non-existent Deity." In the Seed there existed a three-fold Sonship, "in every respect of the same substance with the non-existent God [and] begotten from non-entities." Of this Sonship, part was refined, part gross, or coarse, and part needing purification. The refined part immediately burst forth from the Seed-world and went upwards with a velocity like that of thought, attaining unto the non-existent Deity. The gross portion, not being able to rise, equipped itself with the Holy Spirit as a wing; but the Spirit, not being of the same substance with the non-existent God, nor having "any nature in common with the Sonship," could only come near "that Blessed Place which cannot be conceived or represented by any expression." There it remained, retaining of the Sonship only the fragrance, as a vessel, emptied of the most fragrant ointment, retains the odor, though the ointment is gone. The third Sonship remained in the seed-world, "conferring benefits and receiving them."

After the two ascensions of Sonship took place, the firmament was extended "between the supermundane spaces and the world." This firmament seems to be identical with the Holy Spirit, which remains in suspension below the Ineffable, Non-Existent God. Meanwhile there burst forth from the "Cosmical Seed," or "conglomeration of all germs," as Hippolytus calls it, the Great Archon, —

the "Head of the world, a certain beauty and magnitude and unspeakable power." This Archon soared aloft as far as the firmament, where He paused, supposing the firmament to be the end of all attainment and being. There he became more wise, powerful, comely, lustrous, and beautiful, than any entity except the Sonship which remained in the seed-world. Imagining Himself to be Lord, He addressed Himself to the work of creating "every object in the cosmical system." But first He made a Son, superior to Himself. All this, however, had been willed by the Non-Existent Deity.

The Great Archon, astonished at his Son's beauty, set him at his right hand in what is called the Ogdoad, where the Great Archon has his throne. The Great Archon, now called the Great, Wise Demiurge, then formed the entire celestial creation, — the Son, being wiser than he, operating in him and giving him suggestions. After this another Archon, greater than all subjacent entities save the third Sonship, but far inferior to the first Archon, arose out of the seed-world, or "conglomeration of all germs." He, too, produced a Son wiser than Himself, and became the creator and governor of the aerial world. This region is called the Hebdomad. All this also had been willed by the Non-Existent Deity. Later on in the system, as it is expounded by Hippolytus, the Great Archon is identified with the Ogdoad, "and the Ogdoad is Arrhetus," and the second Archon is identified

with the Hebdomad, and "the Hebdomad is Rhetus." Such is the strange cosmogony which Basilides dreamed out as the basis for his view of the gospel and his theory of salvation.

The third Sonship, meanwhile, has remained behind in the "Seed," but his true place is "near the refined and imitative Sonship and the Non-Existent One," and it is necessary that he should be "revealed and reinstated above." This would be in accordance with the Scripture, "The creation itself groaneth together, and travaileth in pain together, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God." "Now we who are spiritual," says Basilides, "are sons, who have been left here to arrange, and mould, and rectify, and complete the souls which, according to nature, are so constituted as to continue in this quarter of the universe." "Sin, then, reigned from Adam unto Moses."

The Great Archon seemed to be King and Lord of the whole universe, but, in reality, the second Archon, the Hebdomad, "was King and Lord of this quarter of the universe." This latter being is the One who spoke to Moses, saying, "I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and I have not manifested unto them the name of God," — that is, the God Arrhetus, Archon of the Ogdoad. This One is also the source of inspiration to the prophets.

In the condensed report of Basilides which we have in Hippolytus, we are now introduced to the

gospel. There was no descent from above. The blessed Sonship did not withdraw from the Inconceivable and Blessed and Non-Existent God; but the powers, passing upward, caught "the flowing and rushing thoughts of the Sonship," as Indian naphtha catches flame at some distance from the fire. Thus the gospel came first from the Sonship, through the Son of the Archon, to the Archon Himself, who then learned that he "was not God of the universe, but was begotten." By the knowledge that above himself was the Ineffable and Unnameable and Non-Existent One, he was both converted and filled with terror, thus illustrating the Scripture, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." "Being orally instructed by Christ, who was seated near" (evidently by Christ here is meant the Great Archon's Son), he learns concerning the Non-Existent One, the Sonship, the Holy Spirit, "the apparatus of the universe," and the future "consummation of things." This is the wisdom to which St. Paul alludes in his saying, "Not in words of human wisdom, but in [those] taught of the Spirit." The instructed Archon confesses his sin of having magnified Himself. When every creature in the Ogdoad has been "orally instructed and taught, and [after] the mystery becomes known to the celestial [powers]," the gospel is communicated also to the Hebdomad. "The Son of the Great Archon [therefore] kindled in the Son of the Archon of the Hebdomad the light

which Himself possessed and had kindled from above from the Sonship. And the Son of the Archon of the Hebdomad had radiance imparted to Him, and He proclaimed the gospel to the Archon of the Hebdomad." He too is filled with terror and makes confession, and all the beings in the Hebdomad are enlightened. At this point in his account Hippolytus explains that, according to the Basilidians, there is an infinite number of beings, — Principalities, Powers, and Rulers, — inhabiting three hundred and sixty-five heavens, the Great Archon of which is Abrasax, whose name comprises the computed number 365, whence the year consists of so many days.

It now became necessary that the "Formlessness existent in our quarter of the creation" should be illuminated, and the "mystery" revealed to the Sonship which had remained behind in Formlessness. "The light [therefore] which came down from the Ogdoad above to the Son of the Hebdomad, descended from the Hebdomad upon Jesus the Son of Mary." This is the meaning of the Scripture, "The Holy Spirit will come upon thee." The entire Sonship which was left behind, being transformed, "follows Jesus, and hastens upward, and comes forth purified." This whole passage is obscure in Hippolytus, perhaps because of his failure to grasp Basilides' meaning. It is altogether possible that Basilides himself was not quite clear. At any rate, when the entire Sonship shall have

come above the Limitary Spirit, "then the creation shall find mercy, for till now it groans and is tormented and awaits the revelation of the sons of God, that all men of the Sonship may ascend from hence." After this God will bring upon the whole world a Vast Ignorance, that souls whose nature it is to continue immortal in this stage alone may not suffer by craving that which is impossible for them, "like fish desiring to feed with sheep on the mountains;" for such a desire would be their destruction. All things are incorruptible in their place, but a wish to pass beyond the things that are according to nature would be their destruction.

In like manner a Vast Ignorance will lay hold on the Archon of the Hebdomad, and on the Great Archon of the Ogdoad, and all creatures subject to Him, that none may desire things impossible and so be overwhelmed with sorrow. "And so there will be the restitution of all things which, in conformity with nature, have from the beginning a foundation in the seed of the universe, but will be restored at [their own] proper periods. And that each thing, says Basilides, has its own particular times, the Saviour is sufficient [witness] when He observes, 'Mine hour is not yet come.' And the Magi [afford similar testimony] when they gaze wistfully upon [the Saviour's] star."

Jesus, in the Basilidean view, "is the inner spiritual man in the natural (psychical) man; that is, a Sonship leaving its soul here, — not a mor-

tal soul, but one remaining in its present place according to nature, just as the first Sonship up above hath left the Limitary Holy Spirit in a fitting place; He having at that time been clothed with a soul of His own."

The gospel, in the doctrine of Basilides, is the knowledge of super-mundane entities which the Greal Archon did not understand. When it was shown to him that there are the Holy Spirit and the Sonship and the Non-Existent God, who is the cause of all these, he rejoiced and was filled with exultation. The birth of Jesus and all the events of His life occurred "in order that Jesus might become the first-fruits of a distinction of the different orders [of created objects] that had been confused together." For since the world had been divided into an Ogdoad and a Hebdomad and an order under these in which is Formlessness, "it was requisite that the various orders of created objects that had been confounded together should be distinguished by a separating process performed by Jesus." Only the corporeal part of Jesus suffered and reverted to Formlessness; his psychical part was resuscitated and returned to the Hebdomad; that element of his nature which belonged to the region of the Great Archon ascended to be with the Great Archon; and that which pertained to the Spirit remained with the Spirit; and the third Sonship, purified through Him, ascended through all these stages of being to the blessed Sonship.

The whole theory, according to Hippolytus, consists of a conglomeration and confusion of all things in the "Seed-world," and the sorting and restoration of these into their proper places. "Jesus, therefore, became the first-fruits of the distinction of the various orders of created objects, and His passion took place for no other reason than the distinction which was thereby brought about in the various orders of created objects that had been confounded together."

Obscure and difficult as this system is to our minds, we can see that it is an attempt, by means of a colossal symbolism, to arrive at a philosophic explanation of the origin of things, the origin of evil, and the way of salvation. Evil lies in the confusion of the spiritual and psychical with the material, and salvation is by enlightenment and the consequent elimination of the spiritual and psychical from the material. In his moral teaching Basilides inculcated a moderate ascetism. Bunsen maintains that he "was a pious Christian, and worshipped with his congregation," and he says, "He is the first Gnostic teacher who has left an individual personal stamp upon his age. . . . His erudition is unquestionable. He had studied Plato deeply. . . . All that was great in the Basilidean system was the originality of thought and moral earnestness of its founder."

The followers of Basilides seem to have departed both from his ethical principles and his speculative

teachings. They became loose in morals and pronouncedly dualistic in doctrine, and they carried docetism so far that the whole life of Christ was to them a mere sham. "They held it prudent to repudiate Christianity in times of persecution, and practised various sorts of magic, in which the abraxas gems[1] did them service."

The author of the most luxuriant and interesting, and, perhaps, the most profound system of Gnostic thought was VALENTINUS. He was born in Egypt, and was educated at Alexandria in Greek literature and science. As Basilides was said to have been a disciple of Glaucias, an interpreter of St. Peter, so Valentinus was said by his followers to have been a disciple of one Theodas, who was acquainted with St. Paul. The Gnostics were fond of affirming that their secret doctrines were derived from the apostles.

The date of Valentinus' birth is unknown, but from various sources of information it is evident that, during the latter part of Hadrian's reign, he appeared as a teacher in Egypt and Cyprus (in this I follow Lipsius), and that, from about 138 to 160, he taught in Rome. He was at first an orthodox member of the Catholic Church, but quite early, probably before he went to Rome, he began to develop his Gnostic interpretation

[1] So Schaff and others; but the connection of the abraxas gems with the Gnostics is now denied by some scholars and seriously doubted by most.

of Christianity which has made him famous. Tertullian states that he did not separate himself from the Church, but remained in it using a twofold mode of teaching, — an exoteric mode for the simpler believers, and an esoteric mode for the initiated. Tertullian adds also that he was twice temporarily suspended from communion, and was ultimately excommunicated. Hippolytus maintains that, afterwards, he went to Cyprus as a declared heretic. It is generally thought that he died in Cyprus about the year 160, but Irenæus seems to indicate that he died in Rome. He was evidently an able and eloquent man. So distinguished a scholar as Bunsen has vindicated his Christian character.

His writings, as far as they are known to us, consist mainly of fragments of epistles and homilies which have been preserved in the works of Clement. Tertullian mentions that he was the author of psalms, or hymns, and fragments of one or two of these may be found in Hippolytus. One of these fragments of a Gnostic hymn has been metrically translated by Cruice as follows: —

> "All things whirled on by spirit I see,
> Flesh from soul depending,
> And soul from air forth flashing,
> And air from æther hanging,
> And fruits from Bythus streaming,
> And from womb the infant growing."

The system of Valentinus is wrought out with great ability, and his style rises at times into lyric beauty and force of expression.

Somewhat varying accounts of the system are furnished in the writings of Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius. All of these are of course more or less hostile critics of Valentinus, and their accounts are interrupted with criticisms, so that it is impossible without much patient and laborious comparison, to produce a consistent and complete statement of the system. The most that I shall attempt here is a sketch, as brief as is consistent with intelligibleness.

According to Valentinus, then, the originating cause of all being is a Monad variously styled Father, Perfect Æon (Αἰὼν τέλειος), The Beginning (Ἡ Ἀρχή), and Before the Beginning (Προαρχή), who is "unbegotten, imperishable, incomprehensible, inconceivable, productive, and a cause of the generation of all existent things." This Being dwelt in infinite solitude. Then, moved by love, for "He was all love, but love is not love except there be some object of affection," He produced, by emanation, Intellect, or Mind, (Νοῦς), and Truth (Ἀλήθεια). Intellect is the self-consciousness of the Father, and is indissolubly joined with Truth. These two produced Word (Λόγος) and Life (Ζωή), and they, in turn, produced Man (Ἄνθρωπος) and Church (Ἐκκλησία). Thus, Pressensé suggests, is symbolically expressed the truth that "the absolute can be fully manifested only in humanity." Then, for the glory

of the Father, Intellect and Truth produced ten Æons, a perfect number, "because this is the first of those numbers that are formed by plurality, and therefore perfect." Word and Life, seeing that Intellect and Truth "had celebrated the Father of the universe by a perfect number," desired to magnify their progenitors; so they produced twelve Æons, an imperfect number. All these Æons have names that signify predicates or qualities: for example, in the first series we have: Bythus, meaning Profundity; Mixis, Mixture; Ageratos, Ever young; Henosis, Unification; Hedone, Voluptuousness; Macaria, Blessedness, etc.; in the second series we have Paracletus, meaning Comforter; Pistis, Faith; Elpis, Hope; Agape, Love; Sophia, Wisdom, etc. These twenty-eight Æons, namely, Intellect, Truth, Word, Life, Man, Church, the ten emanations of Intellect and Truth, and the twelve emanations of Word and Life, constitute the Pleroma, or Divine fulness.

The harmony of the Pleroma is perfect, since the attraction, or the centripetal force of the Abyss, and the propulsion, or the centrifugal force of emanation, are equal. But discord enters; Sophia, the last of the emanations, desires to enter into fuller union with the Father; she also desires, in imitation of the Father, to produce alone and unaided. All the Æons are arranged in Syzygiæ, or pairs. Sophia, the feminine Æon, succeeds in producing only "a formless and un-

digested substance;" and "this is what Moses asserts, 'the earth was invisible and unfashioned'" ("without form and void" in our Common Version). At once there is confusion in the Pleroma, and all the Æons are filled with fear over the "shapelessness" begotten by Sophia, imagining "that in like manner formless and incomplete progenies of the Æons should be generated, and that some destruction, at no distant period, should at length seize upon the Æons." Sophia herself bursts into weeping and lamentation over the amorphous thing which she has produced. All the Æons then beseech the Father to tranquillize her, and He, in compassion, orders another emanation, and Intellect and Truth produce Christ and the Holy Spirit, "for the restoration of Form, and the destruction of the abortion, and the consolation . . . of Sophia."

There are now thirty Æons. The shapeless thing is cast out, and the Father projects the Great Æon, variously named Staurus (which means *stake* or *cross*), and Horos, and Metocheus, who is fixed inflexibly on the confines of the Pleroma "for the guardianship and defence of the Æons." Christ gives form to the shapeless thing outside, that it may not be lost in utter confusion, making it a lower, or external, Sophia, — a Sophia according to being (*κατ' οὐσίαν*), but not according to knowledge (*κατὰ γνῶσιν*). This inferior double of Sophia is called also Achamoth,

though Hippolytus continues to call her Sophia. Peace is now restored to the Pleroma, and, to celebrate its return and to glorify the Father, all the Æons unite in producing a being of most perfect beauty, who is Jesus, or Soter (Σωτήρ, Saviour); He is also called "Joint Fruit of the Pleroma." This is the conclusion of the first part of "this Gnostic trilogy."

I pause a moment to note some of the curious allegorical interpretations of Scripture used by the Valentinians which are preserved by Irenæus. The thirty years before Jesus entered upon His public ministry mystically indicate the thirty Æons. The twelve years of His age when He disputed with the doctors in the temple indicate the Duodecad of Æons (the twelve produced by Word and Life). The other eighteen Æons are indicated by the first two letters of Jesus' name, — I and η of Ιησοῦς, the numerical value of I in Greek being 10, and of η, 8. The twelfth apostle, Judas, by his apostasy, points to the disastrous passion of Sophia, the twelfth Æon; the same thing is indicated by the woman mentioned in the Gospels, who had been afflicted by an issue of blood twelve years. These examples will give some idea of the fantastic allegorism developed by the Gnostics.

We pass now to the second movement of the Gnostic drama. With the origin of Achamoth begins the real world-process. Sophia had com-

municated to Achamoth all the fire which consumed her. This creature "darts upwards towards the Infinite, painfully beating her wings against the impassable boundary, and crying out passionately for the Divine light and life." Jesus then comes to her relief. He draws forth her passions, and these become "the substance of the matter from which this world is formed:" fear constitutes the psychical, sorrow the material, and despair the demonic, elements. The sorrows of Achamoth are depicted with great beauty of imagery. The seas and fountains and rivers are her tears, and the light that irradiates them is her smile when she remembers her brief glimpse of the Pleroma. Of her fear is born the Demiurge, for "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." This one is the creator of our world, and the God of the Old Testament. He it is who inspired the prophets, and who said: "I am God, and beside Me there is no other."

Achamoth occupies the Ogdoad, immediately beyond the confines of the Pleroma, the sphere of the spiritual, immeasurably above the psychical; while the Demiurge occupies the Hebdomad, and into him Achamoth infuses vigor and energy, so that, though she is really the operating cause, he "imagines that he evolves the creation of the world out of himself." Out of the psychical and material elements he creates men, to a select number of whom Achamoth secretly imparts some

sparks of the spiritual; these constitute the moral aristocracy of mankind, in contrast with psychical and material beings. We have in these pneumatic men the first appearance in Christianity of that idea of predestination which holds so large a place in the post-Reformation theology. This, however, is not at all the predestinationism of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans.

When the creation was completed, and the time came for a revelation of the sons of God, — that is, of the Demiurge, — the Demiurge sends forth a Messiah, whom he had promised by the prophets, causing Him to be born of Mary, through whom he passes like water through a tube. This Messiah is endowed with pneumatical, or spiritual, elements by Achamoth, but He has no hylic, or material, elements which are incapable of being saved. His psychical body is so constituted that it can be seen and handled and may even suffer. On this point the Valentinians divide, — some holding that the psychical Messiah received the spiritual endowment at the Baptism, while others hold that a pneumatical body was produced by the descent of Achamoth upon Mary, with the assistance of the Demiurge. The Messiah, in whom is Jesus, the Soter, or Saviour, produced conjointly by all the Æons, enlightens the Demiurge as to the existence of the Pleroma, and carries the true light to the spiritual portion of mankind which was destined to receive it. In consistency with

all the other Gnostic systems, salvation is by illumination. In the crucifixion and passion of the Messiah, which are interpreted symbolically, the Soter is usually conceived to have no part.

"The saving process consists in the exaltation of the pneumatical element in man, and the end of all things is the separation of the pneumatical and the psychical from the hylical." As a result of this saving process, Achamoth, released from all distress, is joined in celestial marriage with the Soter, and restored to the Pleroma, in company with all spiritual natures — the true Gnostics — who have been married to the angels of the Soter, to celebrate in ineffable blessedness, the eternal marriage feast. "The Demiurge, with all righteous psychical natures, is lifted up to the intermediate place near to, but not in, the Pleroma;" afterwards fire consumes all matter.

Valentinian Gnosticism, though it continued till the sixth century, reached its culmination about the close of the second. A curious document in the Coptic language, one of the very few Gnostic writings that have survived, called "Pistis Sophia," or "The Believing Wisdom," gives its final development. The Valentinian ethics, says Harnack, show

"a fine combination of spiritual freedom with the element of asceticism. Their thesis, that primarily it is not the outward act but the intention that is important, was misunderstood by the fathers of the Church, as if they had given permission to pneumatic persons to live in license,

to deny the faith under persecution, and the like. But there is no foundation for this. The fragments we possess from the writings of Valentinus and his school, show rather that they were second to no Christian body in moral earnestness. The Valentinians appear to have joined in the religious worship of the main body of the Church so long as they were tolerated within it. But along with this they celebrated their own mysteries, in which only the initiated might take part. . . . The various Valentinian schools were above all, united in their attitude towards the Scriptures. They were Biblical theologians; that is to say, they started from the conviction that complete wisdom lay only in the words of Jesus Christ, or, in other words, in the Gospels. They accordingly sought to base their systems throughout on the words of the Lord, applying to these the allegorical method. In a secondary degree, they availed themselves also of the writings of the apostles."

Valentinian Gnosticism had a more powerful influence on the Church than any other form, not even excepting that of Marcion; this appears especially in the Christian method of interpreting Scripture, in Christology, in the later dogma of Purgatory, and in the twofold ethics illustrated in monachism, in which we find set forth a morality for the ordinary Christians, and a higher, ascetical morality for those devoting themselves exclusively to a religious life.

BARDAISAN, or BARDESANES, is usually classed as a Valentinian Gnostic. He was born in Edessa in

154, and survived to a great age. He never broke with the Church (which indeed is true of many Gnostics), and he was famous for his Christian hymns, which were mildly tinctured with Gnosticism. Mœller calls him "the father of Syrian Church-song," and says that "his hymns had such vitality, that even in the fourth century Ephraem Syrus sought to replace them by orthodox compositions, on account of their Gnostic coloring." He preached the gospel for a time in Armenia, but his teachings and influence do not seem to have gone westward further than Syria. Hippolytus ranks him with the Eastern Valentinians, yet there is grave doubt of his ever having been a follower of Valentinus. His doctrine seems to have contained decided Manichæan elements. He wrote against the Marcionites, opposing them, however, because of their harsh rejection of the Old Testament.

With this brief notice of Bardaisan I pass on to notice as briefly the violently anti-Judaistic Gnostics.

Ophites (from ΌΦΙΣ, *serpent*), or *Naassenes* (Hebrew *Nahash*), is a name applied to various sects of Gnostics in whose systems the serpent figures largely, in some of them receiving special honor. Their use of the serpent arose partly from the influence of serpent-symbolism and serpent-worship, which had place in various ancient relig-

ions, notably those of the Egyptians and the Phœnicians, and partly from the exigencies of their fundamental theory.[1] Irenæus maintains that the Ophites originated in the heresy of Simon Magus. They believed that matter is inherently evil, therefore the creator of matter could not be the Supreme Good God. This idea was confirmed by the Old Testament account of the effort of God to keep the first pair of human beings from attaining the knowledge of good and evil. The serpent who promised knowledge to Adam and Eve was evidently their friend. Moreover, it was a serpent-rod by which Moses wrought his miracles; it was a brazen serpent also that saved the perishing Israelites in the wilderness, and was the type of Christ. The serpent, too, held a prominent place among the constellations, and its form was seen in the convolutions of the brain and of the intestines. In most of the Ophite sects, however, the serpent fills only a subordinate place, and its use as a symbol was common to many Gnostic sects; but the name "Ophite" was applied to them opprobriously by the Catholics and it clung. The story is told by Epiphanius, and repeated by Augustine, that some of the Gnostics allowed tame snakes to crawl about and "sanctify" their Eucharistic bread, thus, as it seemed to Catholic Christians, "binding

[1] Salmon observes that "there is sufficient evidence that in the countries where Gnosticism most flourished, a heathen use of the serpent emblem had previously existed."

themselves to the author of evil by a sacrament of abomination."

The Ophites, as they are represented in the pages of Irenæus, held a theory, not only strongly marked with sensuousness, but also containing large Zoroastrian elements. The history of the world is a struggle between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness. In points, the Ophite Gnosticism resembles the system of Saturninus and also the system of Valentinus, though it is more pantheistic, less Christian, and less moral than the latter.

The *Sethites* and *Cainites* were sects of the Ophite Gnostics. The latter looked on the Maker of the world as actually an evil being whom it was virtuous to resist; Cain, therefore, was their hero; they honored also Esau, Korah, and Judas Iscariot, as the true spiritual men. They were charged by Christian writers with great immoralities. They constituted, however, only an insignificant sect.

The chief representative of anti-Judaistic Gnosticism was MARCION. As the conservatism of St. Peter and St. James was caricatured in Ebionism, so the radicalism of St. Paul was caricatured in the Gnosticism of Marcion. Marcion, a wealthy shipowner, was born in Sinope, in Pontus, early in the second century. It is stated that his father was a Christian bishop, but this does not seem to be well-founded, and, probably, he was converted

to Christianity from paganism. He became an ardent Christian, and, notwithstanding his Gnosticism, continued so until his death. About 139 or 140, he came to Rome where he made a liberal contribution of money to the local church. Soon after his arrival he fell in with the Syrian Gnostic, Cerdo, of whom already I have given a brief sketch. Marcion probably had begun to develop his system of thought before this time, but to some extent it was influenced by Cerdo. He earnestly and ably propagated his views, and gained many disciples. His doctrines had a large number of adherents in Rome, and, during his life or afterwards, spread into Egypt, Palestine, Arabia, Syria, Cyprus, and even Persia. Their vigor and attractiveness are evidenced by the fact that among those who wrote against them were such men as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and even Bardaisan. Marcion rejected all of the New Testament writings except ten epistles of St. Paul, excluding the pastoral epistles, and the Gospel of St. Luke, eliminating from the last whatever was incompatible with his system. Harnack is undoubtedly right in saying that Marcion's distinctive teachings "originated in a comparison of the Old Testament with the theology of the apostle Paul." An interesting statement of Harnack's is "that in the second century only one Christian — Marcion — took the trouble to understand Paul; but it must be added that he misunderstood him."

Perplexed with the problem of evil, Marcion adopted the Gnostic view that evil is inseparable from matter; hence he held that the God of the Old Testament, who was the creator of the world, could not be the Supreme Being. He discarded entirely the vast succession of Æons which filled so large a place in the systems of Valentinus and other Gnostics, for his aim was practical religion, rather than subtle speculation. In the Gospel he found a God of goodness and love; in the Old Testament he found a God who was just, stern, jealous, wrathful, and variable. These were entirely incompatible, and he was too conscientious and too earnest to be satisfied with the ordinary solutions of the difficulty. His scheme, which is markedly dualistic, may be epitomized as follows:

The great God who exists in the highest heaven is perfectly good, but is unknown; Jehovah, the Just God, or the Demiurge, exists in the lower heaven; beneath all is matter. Jehovah created man and imposed on him a strict law which he could not keep; man therefore fell under his curse, and at death was cast into hell. This was the miserable condition of the human race until, at last, the Supreme Good God had compassion on their hard lot and sent them His Son. This Son appeared in the fifteenth year of Tiberius in the likeness of a man thirty years old. (Marcion discarded entirely the story of Christ's miraculous birth.) After He had preached and wrought many miracles of healing, Jehovah being jealous,

notwithstanding the Son had perfectly kept His law, caused him to be crucified. Jesus then descended to hell and preached the gospel there, and liberated, not the Old Testament saints, but only sinners and malefactors who obeyed His summons; the former He left to the tender mercies of the God of Law. He then confronted and confounded Jehovah, condemning Him by His own law. "I have a controversy with thee," He said, "but I will take no other judge between us than thine own law. Is it not written in thy law that whoso killeth another shall himself be killed; that whoso sheddeth innocent blood shall have his own blood shed? Let me, then, kill thee and shed thy blood, for I was innocent and thou hast shed my blood." Jehovah, seeing himself condemned by His own law, could make no defence, but confessed his ignorance, saying: "I thought thee but a man, and did not know thee to be a God; take the revenge which is thy due."

It should be said here that Jehovah also had a Messiah, one whom under His inspiration, the prophets predicted. "This inferior Saviour will indeed come, but only for the chosen people of the Demiurge; to them He will bring a salvation worthy of them, — one, namely, that is purely material and earthly." Jesus then raised up Paul and revealed to him the true way of life and salvation. At length Marcion himself was raised up to reannounce the true gospel.

Marcion in his writings drew up a long list of contrasts between the Old and New Testaments. Some of these I quote from Pressensé: "While the Messiah of the Demiurge is a national and local Messiah, Jesus belongs to all mankind. The former promises only earthly good; the latter speaks altogether of heaven. The Demiurge commands the children of Israel to carry away the treasures of Egypt; Jesus directs His disciples not to take so much as a staff in their hand. The Jewish God sent a bear to devour the children who had mocked Elisha, and calls down fire from heaven upon his enemies; the gospel teaches only kindness and forgiveness. Lastly, the merciful Saviour chose as His disciples the outcasts from Judaism." These contrasts Marcion himself thus eloquently summarizes: "While Moses lifts up his hands to heaven, invoking the slaughter of the enemies of Israel, Jesus stretches out His hands upon the cross for the salvation of all mankind."

The way of salvation, according to Marcion, is a way of antipathy to the religion of the Old Testament, and a way of ascetical self-discipline in order to attain purification from all matter. "We are devoted," he said, "to hatred and to grief." He condemned marriage, imposed upon his disciples inviolable chastity, and urged them to invite rather than to shun martyrdom. We read of numerous Marcionite martyrs both before and after

the triumph of Christianity under Constantine. The Marcionites believed in a God of love, and a life of faith and holiness. In their scheme, those who did not believe the gospel were left under the power of the Demiurge; in this they were more charitable than their Catholic opponents. They were ready to die for their faith, but had little care for contention. It is said that in his old age, Apelles, a disciple of Marcion, declined a controversy with Rhodon on their points of difference, expressing his belief that faith in the Crucified, accompanied with a holy life, might suffice for the salvation of either, — a judgment in which we may well concur. Notwithstanding their failure to understand and appreciate the significance of Judaism as a preparation for Christianity, the Marcionites were fundamentally Christian, and their life nobly attested their sincerity and the elevation of their aims. Though they were heretics, they were incomparably superior to the great majority of the Gnostics. The intensity of their hatred to the God of the Old Testament is grotesquely illustrated as late as the fifth century in the savage old man whom Theodoret met, "who washed his face with his own saliva, that he might not borrow even a drop of water from the accursed world of the Demiurge."

Manichæism is a system of doctrine originated in Persia by MANES, or MANICHÆUS, in the third

century. Of Manes' life there are two contradictory accounts, an Eastern and a Western; the latter is derived from the *Acta Archelai*, a Greek forgery dating from about 335 A. D., and the former, from Syrian, Persian, and Arabian chroniclers. Upon the Eastern account we must mainly depend for our knowledge of Manes' life. He was born about 240 A. D. of a Magian family and was well educated in Greek, music, mathematics, geography, astronomy, painting, and medicine, and also, it is said, in the Scriptures. There are traditions that though of Persian parentage, he was born in Babylon; that when he was twelve years old an angel announced to him that when he was older he should abandon his father's sect of the *Moghtasilah*, or "Baptists" (a sect apparently connected with the *Elkesaites* which had sprung up in southern Babylonia, and which probably contained Christian elements); that when he was twenty-four the same angel summoned him to establish Manichæism with the words: "Hail, Manes, from me and from the Lord which has sent me to thee and chosen thee for his work. Now He commands thee to proclaim the glad tidings of the truth which comes from Him, and to bestow thereon thy whole zeal." We are struck with the similarity between this call and the call which was addressed to St. Paul recorded in Acts xxvi.

Manes was evidently endowed with considerable

speculative genius and a brilliant imagination. Whether he ever connected himself with the Church is open to doubt, though there is a tradition that he early showed great zeal for the faith and was ordained a presbyter while quite young. He claimed to be the incarnation of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, promised by Christ to his apostles, and his doctrines combined Christian with Persian elements. About 267 he went to the court of Sapor and at first won the king's favor; but there was at that time a revival of Zoroastrianism, and, when Manes disclosed his full scheme, it was seen to involve the overthrow of the national religion, and the king resolved to put him to death. Manes fled to Turkestan, or even perhaps as far as India, "drawn," says Pressensé, "towards that land of boundless asceticism and sublime pantheism." In his exile he employed his talents in decorating temples with paintings. Then he retired to a cave, or grotto, in which he claimed to have had extraordinary visions. While there he wrote a Gospel, embellishing it with beautiful pictures. With this book he returned to Persia and presented himself at the court of the new king, Hormuz, who embraced his doctrines and gave him protection. Two years later, 273 A. D., Hormuz died and Varanes I. (Bahrám I.) succeeded to the throne. The latter was at first favorable to the sect; but it spread so rapidly as to alarm the national priesthood, and through

their influence the king called Manes to a disputation with the priests. Manes was condemned as a heretic and flayed alive. According to another account his body was cut in two, and a part was suspended over each gate of the city. A vigorous persecution was begun against his followers and many of these were put to death, while others were scattered over Media, China, Turkestan, and other lands. Varanes is reported to have put to death two hundred Manichæans by burying them head downwards, with their feet projecting above the ground. He then boasted that he had a garden planted with men instead of trees.

Manes wrote much, and some of his writings were in existence as late as the eleventh century, but nothing survives now save some fragments. The system of Manes, known as Manichæism, was essentially dualistic and contained elements derived from both Buddhism and Zoroastrianism. It posited two original antagonistic principles: Ahura-Mazda, the good God of Light, and Angro-Mainyus, the evil Prince of Darkness. The Powers of darkness in their wild fury leaped so high that they caught a glimpse of the radiance from the realm of light. When they strove to force their way into this realm, the good God, as a defence, produced an Æon, the Mother of life, and she produced the primeval spiritual Man, whom she equipped, for his struggle, with the five elements, wind, light, water, fire, and matter. These, how-

ever, are ideal elements which are copied by the Prince of Darkness in the actual elements of this lower world. In the conflict the spiritual Man is so far overcome by the spirits of darkness that the Light-King must intervene to rescue and restore him to the Light-Kingdom. Meanwhile, however, some part of his luminous essence, or soul, is caught by the Powers of darkness and imprisoned in material bodies. The rescue of this luminous essence is the process of redemption.

There is, at this point, a similarity between the system of Manes and the system of Valentinus, — the spiritual man who is partly despoiled of his soul suggesting Sophia, and the part of the luminous essence caught and imprisoned in matter suggesting Achamoth.

That which seemed to be a catastrophe turns out to be a device for the destruction of the Powers of darkness. This Manes shows by a parable: A shepherd sees a wild beast about to rush into the midst of his flock. He digs a pit and casts into it a kid; the beast springs into the pit to devour his prey, but cannot extricate himself. The shepherd delivers the kid and leaves the lion to perish.

The imprisoned soul is diffused throughout nature, save a part, which is placed in the sun and moon, whence it draws towards itself the souls shut up in forms of vegetable and animal life. To prevent this process, the Powers of dark-

ness create a man, after the likeness of the first Man, in whom all the spiritual essence in the world is concentrated. This man combines in himself elements of both worlds, his body belonging to the kingdom of darkness and his soul to the kingdom of light. The Prince of Darkness now seeks to fix him in the lower world, and so he invites him to partake of all the trees in the Garden of Paradise save the tree of knowledge. This plot is defeated by Christ, who appears in the form of a serpent. At this point Manichæism resembles the theory of the Ophites. Adam's true fall is due to Eve, who is given to him by the Prince of Darkness as a companion. "She is seductive sensuousness, though also having in her a small spark of light."

Mânichæans violently opposed the Old Testament, in this resembling the Marcionites. They held that salvation consists in resisting the material, and strengthening the spiritual, elements in man. Death is the liberation of the soul "which is carried away by the moon, as by a heavenly vessel, up to the regions of eternal and unclouded light. The waxing of the moon corresponds with the moment when it opens to receive emancipated souls; its waning marks the time when it has deposited its sacred burden safe in the heavenly haven." The part which Christ plays in the Manichæan scheme of redemption is small; He simply imparts knowledge of the true way of life. He appeared as a man, but His birth and sufferings and death were

mere semblances. The process of salvation will be complete when the world has lost all that it contains of the luminous essence, and then the primeval spiritual Man will appear again, and matter will be destroyed by fire.

Manichæism was necessarily ascetical. In the church organized by Manes there were two classes: the *Elect*, or *Perfect*, who cast aside all bonds of society and marriage, devoted themselves to celibacy and contemplation, discarded all possessions, and refused to do any work; and the *Hearers*, who were subject to less strict rules than the Elect, and whose duty it was to support the Elect. In this there is decided trace of Buddhism. Of the Elect, who despised industry and exalted idleness into a principle of religion, Epiphanius says: —

"When they are about to eat bread, they first pray and pronounce these words: 'I have not gathered in nor ground the grain, neither have I sent it to the mill. Another has done these things, and has brought thee to me. I eat thee without reproaches, for he who reaps shall himself be reaped, and he who sends corn to the mill shall himself be ground to powder.'"

Manes, after Christ's example, appointed twelve apostles for the government of his church; over these was a thirteenth who represented Manes and presided over all; and under them were seventy-two bishops, and deacons and travelling missionaries. He established a rigorous system of fasts, Sunday being always one of the fast days, and care-

fully prescribed the hours for prayer. The Manichæan was to pray four times a day, preceding each prayer by ablutions, and in his devotions was to turn towards the sun, or moon, or the north, according to the hour, as the seat of light. Despite the violent death of Manes, and the severe persecution which fell upon his followers, Manichæism spread rapidly and widely in the East, reaching as far as Thibet, India, and China. In 287 an edict was promulgated against the Manichæans in Africa by Diocletian, and severe and bloody laws were enacted against them by Valentinian in 372, and by Theodosius in 381. Late in the fourth century they numbered among their adherents so able a man as the great Augustine. From Africa the sect spread into Spain and Gaul. The Manichæans maintained their existence through the middle ages and, as late as the last century, according to Gibbon, they were numerous in Bulgaria, Macedonia, Thrace, and Epirus. Indeed there is evidence that they still exist in Mesopotamia and Syria. Though they are always classed among the heretics, the Manichæans were less an heretical sect in the Church than a rival organization, with doctrines and rites borrowed from Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, and Christianity.

The rise and development of Gnosticism in the Church was not an unmixed evil. In the first place, it powerfully stimulated and developed Christian

apologetics, and, in the second place, it gave the impulse out of which arose systematic Christian theology. The Gnostics were the first who attempted to put Christianity into an intelligible relation to other religions, and to create a comprehensive Christian philosophy of the world. Among the evil elements of Gnosticism, which linger even to the present time, were its idea of the radical opposition between matter and spirit, and its consequent exaltation of asceticism, and its idea of the infinite distance between God and His world. These two main ideas exerted a profound and permanent influence on the whole Latin theology, which, from the time of Augustine until the present century, has so largely determined the character of Christian thought.

There were other divergent, or antagonistic, tendencies which developed within the Church, and which are more properly denominated heretical, in the later sense of the word. These were *Montanism*, which was at once Illuminist and Puritanical, and *Rationalism*,[1] which took form in the tenets of various parties known as *Monarchians*. Of these I can give but the briefest notice.

Montanism arose in the latter half of the second century in Phrygia, Asia Minor. MONTANUS, from whom the sect took its name, believed himself to be

[1] I scarcely need to say that I use the term "Rationalism" here in the sense in which it is used in historical and polemical theology.

the organ of the Holy Spirit. Some have affirmed that he claimed to be identical with the Paraclete, but of this there is doubt. He had two disciples, women, named respectively Priscilla and Maximilla, who were prophetesses and fell into strange ecstasies in which they "spoke with tongues." These women were vigorous propagators of the doctrines taught by Montanus. The sect rapidly grew in numbers. It spread into Italy and Africa, and in Carthage numbered among its adherents the famous Tertullian. In general its doctrines did not diverge greatly from the Catholic doctrines.

Montanus held that the age of the Spirit promised by Jesus had come, and that inspiration, therefore, was not confined to the apostles. He laid great emphasis on prophesying, "as the means appointed by God for the edification and guidance of the Church." "The true condition for prophesying," according to the Montanist view, "was that form of ecstasy in which all self-control is lost, and the soul rendered utterly passive in the hands of God, — the condition of one in absolute trance." In practice the Montanists were ascetical. They increased the number of fasts, forbade second marriages, encouraged celibacy, abstained from holding any political offices, and punished mortal sins, such as adultery and apostasy, committed after baptism, with absolute and final excommunication. God, they said, might pardon such sins, but the Church had no power to do so. They

met persecution with undaunted courage, courting rather than shunning martyrdom. They also opposed the hierarchical tendency of the Church, ranking a "prophet" higher than a bishop.

The *Monarchian* sects were all anti-trinitarian; that is, they all affirmed that there is but one Person in the Godhead. They were commonly divided into two classes: those who, like Theodotus of Byzantium, denied the Incarnation, and held that Jesus was only "a man endowed with a peculiar fulness of the Holy Spirit;" and those who, like Sabellius, held that the one God revealed Himself under the three modes of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In the view of the latter, Christ was literally "God manifest in the flesh." These were called *Patripassians*, because their doctrine seemed to involve the crucifixion and suffering of the Father.

Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch from 260 to 272, held that Christ was only a man, and therefore had no pre-existence, but, through the indwelling of the Logos, he progressively became divine.

In its strife with these divergent thinkers the Church anticipated the great struggle with Arianism, which began early in the fourth century, about 318, and continued till the end of the sixth century.

Against the inroads of Gnosticism, and the disintegrating force of other forms of heresy, the early Church developed able defenders. If, in the objective struggle with heathenism and under assaults

of fire and sword and savage beasts, she was passive and patient, exhausting persecution by her capacity for endurance, — in the subjective struggle with hostile intellectual forces, both pagan and nominal-Christian, the Church was active and aggressive, not remaining on the defensive, but pushing the contest for the faith into every antagonistic camp.

In the last lecture I spoke of the principal apologists. Most of those were vigorous in assailing heresy as well as in parrying heathen attack. Among the defenders of the faith from assaults within the Church in the second century none was more able and effective than IRENÆUS. Born a little before 140 A. D. in Asia Minor, where also he was educated, he early went to Gaul, in which country the greater part of his life was spent. He became a presbyter in the church in Lyons, and in 178, immediately after the frightful persecution in which the aged bishop Pothinus perished, he was called to the episcopate, which office he filled with such ability that he has been called " the greatest bishop of the second century, and the representative of the catholicity of the day." Of his writings only one complete work survives. This is, in part, an elaborate and, in the main, judicious, criticism of the various forms of Gnosticism which had developed before the close of the century. His book has great value as showing the theological development in the early Church. " Irenæus," says

Harnack, "holds the same relation to the theology of the Greek Fathers that Tertullian does to the doctrinal system of the Church of the West. . . . It is from [him] also that we get the earliest form of the creed which afterwards, through the labor of councils and theologians, became what we now know as the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed." He exerted also a strong irenical influence on the Eastern controversy. His death, possibly by martyrdom, took place not far from 202 A. D.

In a peculiar sense Irenæus stood as a representative of the apostolic tradition, and his defence of the simple basic elements of the Christian faith was of immense service to the Church. His criticism of Gnosticism, though not entirely adequate, nor always perfectly just, was motived by his calm yet intense loyalty to the fundamental facts and truths of the gospel.

Of Gnosticism I have already said all that my time allows, and yet I cannot close without a few words as to the Gnostics, and as to the general significance of heresy in the early Church.

The Gnostics have seldom, perhaps never, received entire justice at the hands of Christian interpreters and critics. Their systems strike the Occidental mind as so unreal and grotesque, and their thought is so completely involved in extravagant allegory and colossal symbolism, that most students are repelled and quickly lose the patient

and sympathetic temper which is necessary to a true understanding of the Gnostic aim. These men were not lunatics or mere wild dreamers. They were usually, at least often, serious and very earnest men, in whose minds the various currents of Oriental pantheism and mysticism and Hellenic philosophical speculation met and mingled with the Hebrew idea of creation and the new Christian idea of redemption, and who out of these were seeking to fashion a complete philosophy of God, the universe, and human history. Their attempts seem to us to have issued, and, indeed, did issue in grotesque failures; but in these attempts certain great structural principles of theology at least germinally appeared. The entire significance of Christian thought as an historical development will scarcely be grasped by him who does not master the main elements of second-century Gnosticism.

The treatment of heresy by the early Church was determined by its invincible instinct for the elemental Christian facts and truths, and its obstinate sense of the dependence of its integrity and life on the preservation of these.

With the development of Christian dogma, heresy took on a different signification, and the spirit and attitude of the Church towards heresy greatly changed. From the rise of the Trinitarian controversy onward we enter a new atmosphere as well as a new stage in the history of the Church, some apprehension of which we shall get in the remaining two lectures.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA.

THE Christian school of Alexandria, of which I am now to speak, must be distinguished from the "Alexandrian school" known in the history of literature and philosophy. The latter term designates, properly, two schools: one which, concerning itself chiefly with literature, took its rise early in the history of Alexandria, and passed into decadence before the beginning of the Christian era; another, which sprang from the contact between Greek and Jewish thought, and concerned itself mainly with philosophy, was a later development. The latter school produced Neo-Platonism, which arose about the beginning of the third century, and was a combination of Greek and Roman metaphysics, modified both by the speculations of Philo and by Christianity. Its chief representatives were Ammonius Saccas (who died in A. D. 241), Plotinus (d. 269), Porphyry (d. 305), Jamblicus (d. 330), and Proclus (d. 485). Interesting as this is, it can have at the present time no notice beyond a passing allusion. Preceding the distinct rise of Neo-Platonism was Jewish-Platonism, which, beginning with Aristobulus about

160 B. C., attained its final expression in Philo-Judæus. This, blended with Oriental theosophic and Christian elements, produced Gnosticism; and both Jewish-Platonism and Gnosticism exerted a powerful influence on Alexandrine Christianity.

Alexandria, founded by Alexander the Great in 332 B. C., became, under the Ptolemies, the home of letters and the centre of intellectual life and scientific activity. The city was adorned with many magnificent buildings, such as the Museum, the Serapeum (the temple of Serapis, in which was an image of the tutelary god), and the Sebastion, all founded by royal munificence. Here in three great libraries, aggregating 700,000 volumes, were gathered all the wealth of ancient and contemporary literature and science. The city was thronged with professors, philosophers, and rhetoricians. Here gathered students and pleasure-seekers from all nations, — not only from Italy and Greece and Syria, but also from Ethiopia, Arabia, Bactria, Scythia, Persia, and even India. The Jews came hither in great numbers. Philo estimates that in his day there were quite one million Jews in Alexandria, and it is evident that they were not only more numerous, but also more wealthy and influential here than in any other city of the Empire. Of the five districts of the city, they practically appropriated two, and occupied portions of the other three, while many inhabited the country districts round about. "They had their own senate and magistrates, who apportioned the

taxation and settled the disputes of the community." They enjoyed equal rights with the Greek burgesses, and possessed immunities which were denied even to the native Copts.

As early, probably, as 250 B. C., under Ptolemy Philadelphus, who appears in history as a munificent patron of literature, the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into the Greek version of the Septuagint was begun, and it was substantially finished by 221 B. C. This work of translation by Alexandrian Jews was naturally undertaken to meet the wants of the Jewish population, which even at that time was large. All of these spoke Greek, while many of them were unfamiliar with Hebrew. A legendary account tells us that Ptolemy Philadelphus desired a copy of the Jewish Scriptures for his great library, and was advised to apply to the High-Priest at Jerusalem. In response to his application seventy-two scholars were sent, six for each of the twelve tribes, who were lodged in thirty-six cells on the island of Pharos, where, in seventy-two days, each scholar produced a separate version, and these versions, when they were compared, proved to be exactly alike. The story is interesting, but, of course, worthless. The fact, however, remains that the translation was made, and that the opportunity was given for that curious intellectual compound which is known as Jewish-Platonism.[1]

[1] Wellhausen and others maintain that the Septuagint was both begun and completed at dates considerably later than those I

Jewish-Platonism was the attempted combination of the faith of the synagogue with the speculations of the Greek philosophers. The Jewish-Platonists, clinging with characteristic Jewish tenacity to their religious traditions and ideas, resorted to the most elaborate allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, by which they were enabled to blend the doctrines of Plato and the Stoics with the teachings of Moses. Of Jewish-Platonism, Philo-Judæus was the last and fullest exponent.

The date of Philo's birth is unknown, but it must have been some time before the beginning of the Christian era, since he is spoken of as an old man in A. D. 39. His birthplace was probably Alexandria, and, according to Jerome, he was of priestly descent. The scion of a distinguished and wealthy family, he received the best education afforded by the times in the most intellectual city of the world. He became thoroughly acquainted with the Greek poets and philosophers, and was also deeply versed in the Hebrew Scriptures. Profoundly as he was affected by Greek speculation, he remained to the end an ardent believer in his ancestral religion, though his interpretation of that religion was such as to call forth the epi-

have given; but it has not been proved, I believe, that the larger part of the Septuagint was not in existence before the time of Aristobulus, 160 B. C. The precise date, however, does not affect the general proposition that the rise of Jewish-Platonism had its occasion in the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek.

grammatic comment that Philo Platonizes or Plato Philonizes. Of his domestic life, almost nothing is known. It is said that he was married, though his treatment of woman in his writings might lead one to think otherwise. A pleasant story is told of his wife which we should like to think true. It is said that she appeared once without jewels in an assembly of noble women, and, when asked why she alone of them all wore no golden ornaments, she replied that a husband's virtue was sufficient ornament for his wife.

The influence of Philonic-Platonism on Christian teachers appears in their treatment of the Scriptures, their conception of the Logos, and their idea of knowledge (*gnosis*) in its relations to faith. This system also powerfully promoted, and to a great extent shaped, the development of Alexandrian Gnosticism. Amidst these influences arose the Christian Catechetical school in Alexandria, as early at least as the last quarter of the second century. This school was founded for the purpose of giving religious instruction to the children of Christian parents, and preparing catechumens for baptism, but it soon broadened its scope so as to meet the special needs of adult converts who had been trained in pagan learning and were subject to the fascinations of Philonism, the Neo-Platonic philosophy, and Gnosticism. Its pupils were of both sexes. In such a school and amidst such surroundings, teachers were needed

who knew Greek religion and philosophy, and who understood, as did Clement, that "all culture is profitable, and particularly necessary is the study of Holy Scripture, to enable us to prove what we teach, and especially when our hearers come to us from the discipline of the Greeks." Under able and devoted masters this school sought to give, not merely instruction in the traditions of apostolic teaching, but a scientific exposition of Christianity which should be fundamentally in full accord with those traditions. The school was eagerly sought by educated pagans, as well as Christians, and by young men who desired to prepare themselves for service in the Church. It thus became, to some extent, a theological seminary. Here Christian theology, in the deeper sense of that term, was born. The Christian teachers had to meet a threefold opposition: the criticism of cultivated paganism, such as that of the acute and able Celsus; the speculations of Gnosticism; and the hostility of Christians who both feared and despised philosophy as a device of the devil to pervert men from the faith of the gospel. To the first it presented the reasonableness, elevation, and inclusiveness of the Christian philosophy. To the second it opposed the true Gnosis, which did not exclude faith but elaborated the rational contents of faith, and therefore subjectively authenticated the factual basis of Christianity. Faith, it held, was not a substitute for knowledge, but the organ of

knowledge. In the language of Clement, "Faith is, so to speak, the compendious knowledge of essentials; Gnosis, the incontrovertible demonstration of the things received by faith, erected on the foundation of faith, through the doctrine of our Lord, whereby faith is raised to an irrefragable scientific knowledge." Moreover, knowledge is inseparable from life.

"As is the doctrine," said Clement, "so also must be the life; for the tree is known by its fruit, not by its blossoms or its leaves. The Gnosis comes, then, from the fruit and the life; not from the doctrine and the blossom. For we say that the Gnosis is not merely doctrine, but a divine science; — it is that light, dawning within the soul from obedience to God's commands, which makes all things clear; teaches man to know all that is contained in creation and in himself, and instructs him how to maintain fellowship with God; for what the eye is to the body, such is the Gnosis to the mind."

To the third form of opposition it disclosed the comprehensiveness of the gospel idea, and the necessity of knowledge and training in order to understand and expound the Scriptures; besides, it is necessary to study philosophy in order to detect its sophistries, and so to defend the apostolic doctrine, and to commend Christianity to the heathen.

"If *the philosophy* is unprofitable," said Clement, "yet the *study* of it is profitable, if there is profit to be derived from thoroughly demonstrating that it is an unprofitable

thing. Then again, we cannot condemn the heathens by merely pronouncing sentence on their dogmas; we must enter with them into the development of each in detail, until we compel them to acquiesce in our sentence; for that sort of refutation wins the most confidence which is united with a thorough knowledge of the matter in hand."

In further defence of the method of the school, Clement forcibly says: "We must offer to the Greeks, who seek after that which passes with them for wisdom, things of a kindred nature, so that they may come, as it may be expected they will, in the easiest way, through what is already familiar to them, to the belief of the truth. For I become all things to all men, says the apostle, that I may win all."

The beginning of the school lies in some obscurity. It is said that Athenagoras was its first head. What is known of him I have already stated in the lecture on the Apologists.[1] The first teacher of whom we clearly know, and who is commonly considered the first master of the school, was PANTÆNUS. It is doubtful whether he was a Christian by birth and training, or a convert from paganism. He probably was born in Sicily, since Clement calls him "the Sicilian bee." By some he is said to have been a Platonic eclectic, and it is apparent that he was thoroughly acquainted with the Stoic, Pythagorean, and Platonic ideas.

[1] See pages 246 ff.

He began his work in Alexandria in A. D. 180, and, according to Origen, was the first Christian teacher who availed himself of his heathen learning in the exposition of Christianity. This implies that he made a fuller and more systematic use of that learning than either Justin Martyr or Athenagoras, both of whom had brought the resources of their pagan culture into service in defending and propagating the gospel. Pantænus' work as head of the school seems to have been interrupted, since Eusebius tells us that he went on an evangelistic tour to India. The Indians, on account of his fame as a teacher, desired to meet and hear him, and they sent a deputation with the request that he would visit them. This mission of Pantænus indicates that already he had been ordained as a presbyter, although no mention is made of the fact. In India he found, and, according to Jerome's statement, brought back with him, a Gospel by St. Matthew in Hebrew. Pantænus was learned, ardent, eloquent and large-minded. He may have left some writings, but all save a few fragments are lost. It is probable that these are rather the reports of oral teaching than literary productions. His personal influence was great, and it was by this, rather than by any literary activity, that he accomplished his work; though Eusebius says that in his writings he "interpreted the treasures of the divine dogmas," and Jerome adds that he left "many commentaries on the

Scriptures." His work in the school ended in 189, and he was succeeded by his pupil and fellow-teacher, Clement. The date of his death is unknown, but it falls somewhere between 193 and 211.

The successor of Pantænus was TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS, known in ecclesiastical literature as Clement of Alexandria. His name, Flavius Clemens, suggests the name of Flavius Clemens who was martyred by Domitian in 96, and it has been inferred that he was a descendant of the consul. He was born somewhere between 150 and 160, and was an Athenian in training, if not by birth. Like his predecessor, he was learned in all the literature, science, philosophy, and mythology of the heathen. An ardent spirit, he wandered far and wide, in his early years, in search of truth. In his writings he mentions six illustrious Christian teachers under whom he studied. At last, in Egypt, he found Pantænus, and with him found rest. Here, in Alexandria, he made his home, and probably for a time was a pupil of Pantænus in the Catechetical school. He was ordained a presbyter, and, in 189, was appointed master of the school, in which for a little time he had been an assistant. Here he taught until 202 or 203, when he fled from a persecution under Septimius Severus and never returned. We hear of him later in the company of one of his old pupils, Alexander, at that time a bishop in Cappadocia, and afterwards bishop of

Jerusalem, who was in prison on account of the faith. Alexander was much comforted by his presence, considering it providential. On the departure of Clement, Alexander charged him with a letter to the church in Antioch, congratulating them upon the election of Asclepiades to the episcopate, in which he thus speaks of Clement: "This epistle, my brethren, I have sent to you by Clement, the blessed presbyter, a man endued with all virtue, and well approved, whom you already know, and will learn still more to know; who also, coming hither by the providence and superintendence of the Lord, has confirmed and increased the Church of God." This is the last notice we have of Clement's movements; the date of his death is unknown, though it has been suggested variously as 213 and 220. Among his pupils were Origen and the Alexander above mentioned, and, perhaps, also Hippolytus.

Of the works of Clement, Eusebius and Jerome enumerate ten, though many others are mentioned by Clement himself as already written, or to be written. Of the ten referred to, two are entirely lost, four survive in fragments, and four remain to us practically entire. Of the extant works, the most important are, "The Exhortation to the Greeks," "The Instructor," and "The Miscellanies" (Στρωματεῖς, which means "coverlet," then, "patchwork," of which coverlets often were made). The fourth extant work, entitled "Who

is the Rich Man that is Saved?" is a study, in the form of a popular address, of the incident related in Mark's Gospel, x. 17–22. Its teaching is characterized as "simple, eloquent, and just." It closes with the story of St. John and the young robber which Eusebius, quoting from Clement, incorporated in his History. It is in substance as follows: —

St. John, after the death of Domitian, returned from the isle of Patmos to Ephesus. From this city he was accustomed to go out into the neighboring regions to appoint bishops, to institute new churches, and to render other apostolic services. In one city, after having ordained a bishop, he committed to his care "a youth of fine stature, graceful countenance, and ardent mind," saying, "Him I commend to you with all earnestness, in the presence of the Church and of Christ." The bishop promised to care for him with all diligence, and St. John returned to Ephesus. The youth was cherished, educated, disciplined, and finally baptized. Then his guardian somewhat relaxed his care, and the youth fell under the influence of "certain idle, dissolute fellows," who led him first into dissipation, and then by degrees into crime. Going from bad to worse, the young man at last committed a crime so grave as to involve for him and his associates, in case they were caught, the punishment of death. Thereupon he fled from his home, and, having exceeded his

associates in daring, he was chosen by them as captain, and he formed them into a band of robbers who preyed upon the surrounding country. After a time the apostle returned and claimed the youth of the bishop to whom he had committed him as his "deposit." The bishop, now an old man, "groaning heavily and also weeping, said, 'He is dead.' 'How, and what death?' 'He is dead to God,' said he, 'he has turned out wicked and abandoned, and at last a robber; and now, instead of the Church, he has beset the mountain with a band like himself.'" At this, the apostle, with great lamentation, called for a horse and guide, and rode away in search of the prodigal. Soon he was captured by an outpost of the bandits. He demanded to be taken to their leader. As the latter saw the aged St. John approaching he turned and fled; but the apostle, forgetful of his age, pursued him, crying: "Why dost thou fly, my son, from me, thy father, — thy defenceless, aged father? Have compassion on me, my son; fear not. Thou still hast hope of life. I will intercede with Christ for thee. Should it be necessary, I will cheerfully suffer death for thee, as did Christ for us. I will give my life for thine. Stay; believe Christ hath sent me." At this the robber stopped, threw away his weapons, and then, trembling and bursting into tears, he caught the apostle in his arms. Finally, yielding to St. John's entreaties, and hearing his prayers to Christ on his

behalf, the robber abandoned his companions and returned with him to his home, where he was at last restored to the church, "a powerful example of true repentance, and . . . a trophy of a visible resurrection."

"The Exhortation to the Greeks," an apologetic work in twelve chapters, was designed to win pagans to the Christian faith. It is in Clement's best literary style, and abounds in passages of great force and beauty. In the very first chapter the author eloquently appeals to his readers to turn from the foolish fables of heathenism, and to listen to the invitations of the Divine Word. He begins by citing the fable of Eunomos the Locrian, who, while playing the Pythic dirge, broke a string of his lyre, whereupon a "grasshopper sprang on the neck of the instrument, and sang on it as on a branch; and the minstrel, adapting his strain to the grasshopper's song, made up for the want of the missing string." "How," asks Clement, "have you believed vain fables, and supposed animals to be charmed by music; while Truth's shining face alone, as would seem, appears to you disguised, and is looked on with incredulous eyes?" Let "raving poets, now quite intoxicated," he exclaims, be crowned with ivy, and let the whole frenzied rabble, with the satyrs and the rest of the demon crew, be confined to Cithæron and Helicon. "But let us bring from above out of Heaven, Truth, with Wisdom in all its bright-

ness, and the sacred prophetic choir, down to the holy mount of God; and let Truth, darting her light to the most distant points, cast her rays all around on those that are involved in darkness, and deliver men from delusion, stretching out her very strong right hand, which is wisdom, for their salvation. And raising their eyes, and looking above, let them abandon Helicon and Cithæron, and take up their abode in Sion." The heathen beguilers of men lead them only to destruction, but the Lord, "the celestial Word," draws them to salvation. "The Lord pities, instructs, exhorts, admonishes, saves, shields, and of His bounty promises us the kingdom of heaven as a reward for learning; and the only advantage He reaps is, that we are saved. For wickedness feeds on men's destruction; but Truth, like the bee, harming nothing, delights only in the salvation of men."

Of the Saviour he says: He "has many tones of voice, and many methods for the salvation of men; by threatening He admonishes, by upbraiding He converts, by bewailing He pities, by the voice of song He cheers."

Through page after page of graceful writing, loaded with classic allusion and illustration, he vividly exposes the licentiousness and absurdity of the heathen rites, showing a familiarity with them which indicates that he himself, perhaps, had been initiated into "the mysteries." After setting forth the cruelty of the sacrifices offered

to the gods, and the shamefulness of the images by which they were worshipped, he cites the opinions of the philosophers and poets respecting the true God, quoting from Plato: "Around the King of all are all things, and He is the cause of all good things," and asking: "Who, then, is the King of all? God, who is the measure of the truth of all existence," — quoting from Antisthenes: "God is not like to any; wherefore no one can know him from an image;" and from Xenophon: "How great and powerful He is who moves all things, and is Himself at rest, is manifest; but what He is in form is not revealed;" and from the Pythagoreans: "God is one; and He is not, as some suppose, outside of this frame of things, but within it; but, in all the entireness of His being, is in the whole circle of existence, surveying all nature, and blending in harmonious union the whole, — the author of all His own forces and works, the giver of light in heaven, and Father of all, the mind and vital power of the whole world, the mover of all things."

The book closes with an appeal to his readers to abandon their ancient errors and to listen to Christ. I quote a single characteristic passage:

"Come, O madman, not leaning on the thyrsus, not crowned with ivy: throw away the mitre, throw away the fawn-skin; come to thy senses. I will show thee the Word, and the mysteries of the Word, expounding them after thine own fashion. This is the mountain beloved of

God, not the subject of tragedies like Cithæron, but consecrated to dramas of the truth, — a mount of sobriety, shaded with forests of purity; and there revel on it not the Mænades, the sisters of Semele, who was struck by the thunderbolt, practising in their initiatory rites unholy division of flesh, but the daughters of God, the fair lambs, who celebrate the holy rites of the Word, raising a sober choral dance. The righteous are the chorus; the music is a hymn of the King of the universe. The maidens strike the lyre, the angels praise, the prophets speak; the sound of music issues forth, they run and pursue the jubilant band; those that are called make haste, eagerly desiring to receive the Father."

There are in this writing, judged from our point of view, defects both of taste and of logic, but on the whole it is well suited to its purpose, which was to show the essential superiority of Christianity over the religions and philosophies of heathenism, and to persuade the heathen to accept the lofty teaching and pure morality of the Divine Word.

"The Instructor," or Tutor (Παιδαγωγός), a work in three books, containing in all thirty-eight chapters, is a manual for the instruction and training of Christians who had been rescued from the pollutions of heathenism. Its aim is practical rather than theoretical, and, though it contemplates always the knowledge (*gnosis*) which is essential to a completely developed Christian life, it sets forth in minute detail the morals and manners that are proper for a Christian. The first

book is entirely taken up with the exposition of the office, method and character of the Instructor, who "is the holy God Jesus, the Word, who is the guide of all humanity. The loving God Himself is our Instructor." The remaining two books treat of a great variety of subjects: of eating, drinking, clothes, ornaments, bathing, domestic and marital relations, exercise, amusements, conduct in church and out of church, and a multitude of other matters. The treatise ends with a prayer to the Instructor, and a hymn to Christ the Saviour. A literal translation of part of the hymn I have already given in the second lecture.[1]

I quote at random some specimens of Clement's counsel. On Eating he says: —

"We must guard against those articles of food which persuade us to eat when we are not hungry, bewitching the appetite. For is there not within a temperate simplicity a wholesome variety of eatables? Bulbs,[2] olives, certain herbs, milk, cheese, fruits, all kinds of cooked food without sauces; and if flesh is wanted, let roast rather than boiled be set down."

The reason he gives for using roast, rather than boiled flesh, is, that Jesus, after His resurrection, when He asked for something to eat, received from His disciples "a piece of broiled fish." In the chapter on Drinking, after derisively condemning

[1] See page 83.

[2] A bulbous wild root, much esteemed in Greece.

the excessive luxury of which many rich are guilty, he pithily says: —

"The best riches is poverty of desires; and the true magnanimity is not to be proud of wealth, but to despise it. Boasting about one's plate is utterly base. For it is plainly wrong to care much about what any one who likes may buy from the market. But wisdom is not bought with coin of earth, nor is it sold in the market-place, but in heaven. And it is sold for true coin, the immortal Word, the regal gold."

In the chapter on Laughter he says: —

"Pleasantry is allowable, not waggery. Besides, even laughter must be kept in check; for when given vent to in the right manner it indicates orderliness, but when it issues differently it shows a want of restraint. For, in a word, whatever things are natural to men we must not eradicate from them, but rather impose on them limits and suitable times. For man is not to laugh on all occasions because he is a laughing animal, any more than the horse neighs on all occasions because he is a neighing animal."

Concerning the Use of the Tongue he says: —

"We ought not to speak long or much, nor ought we to speak frivolously. Nor must we converse rapidly and rashly. For the voice itself, so to speak, ought to receive its just dues; and those who are vociferous and clamorous ought to be silenced. . . . It is with triflers as with old shoes: all the rest is worn away by evil; the tongue only is left for destruction."

On Clothes he gives his judgment that the covering ought —

"to show that which is covered to be better than itself, as the image is superior to the temple, the soul to the body, and the body to the clothes. But now, quite the contrary, the body of these ladies, if sold, would never fetch a thousand Attic drachmas. Buying, as they do, a single dress at the price of ten thousand talents, they prove themselves to be of less use and less value than cloth. Why in the world do you seek after what is rare and costly, in preference to what is at hand and cheap? It is because you know not what is really beautiful, what is really good, and seek with eagerness shows instead of realities, from fools who, like people out of their wits, imagine black to be white."

In a chapter devoted to reproof of excessive fondness for jewels and gold ornaments, he gives a long and curious list of the various ornaments in use, and then exclaims: "I am weary and vexed at enumerating the multitude of ornaments; and I am compelled to wonder how those who bear such a burden are not worried to death. Oh, foolish trouble! Oh, silly craze for display! They squander meretricious wealth on what is disgraceful; and in their love for ostentation disfigure God's gifts." He tells the story that "Apelles, the painter, seeing one of his pupils painting a figure loaded with gold color to represent Helen, said to him, 'Boy, being incapable of painting her beautiful, you have made her rich.'" Concerning earrings, he says: —

Let not ears "be pierced, contrary to nature, in order to attach to them earrings and ear-drops. For it is not right to force nature against her wishes. Nor could there be any better ornament for the ears than true instruction, which finds its way naturally into the passages of hearing. And eyes anointed by the Word, and ears pierced for perception, make a man a hearer and a contemplator of divine and sacred things, the Word truly exhibiting the true beauty 'which eye hath not seen nor ear heard before.'"

I leave the "Instructor" with a quotation from the chapter on Frugality: —

"A fair provision for the journey to heaven is theirs who bear frugality with chaste gravity. And as the foot is the measure of the shoe, so also is the body of what each individual possesses. But that which is superfluous, what they call ornaments and the furniture of the rich, is a burden, not an ornament to the body. He who climbs to the heavens by force, must carry with him the fair staff of beneficence, and attain to the true rest by communicating to those who are in distress."

"The Miscellanies," the most extensive and the most significant of Clement's works, has come down to us in seven books. There probably were no more, though Eusebius speaks of eight. What is printed as a fragment of the eighth book seems to be matter introductory to a work on logic. The beginning of the first book is wanting. This work of Clement's, though it is not in any sense a systematic treatise, and was not meant

by its author to be such, has profoundly influenced many Christian thinkers. It is still of very great value, both because it contains important materials for the history of Christian thought, and its relations to Gnosticism and Neoplatonism, and because in it are found, expressly or by implication, every great principle of the Greek, as contrasted with the Latin, theology.

Clement was thoroughly a lover of truth, and he had that catholicity of mind which led him to study, and enabled him in some real sense to understand, all systems of contemporaneous thought. Of him it justly has been said that he was the first "to bring all the culture of the Greeks and all the speculations of Christian heretics to bear on the exposition of Christian truth." In a time of great intellectual commotion, when, in its struggle with diverting or antagonistic forces both within and without the Church, the Christian mind was beginning to shape a theology that should fitly embody the contents of its faith and its interpretation of the world, Clement grasped the truth that Christianity is legitimately the heir of all the past, and possesses the key to the interpretation of the future. "Sixteen centuries," says Westcott, "have confirmed the truth of his principle, and left its application still fruitful."

Clement, unlike Tertullian and Hermias, who utterly rejected the speculations of the Greek philosophers as evil both in origin and in in-

fluence, conceived of philosophy as a divinely ordained preparation of the Greeks for faith in Christ, as the law of Moses was a similar preparation of the Hebrews. While thus hospitable toward Greek philosophy, he assumed an attitude toward Gnosticism that gave him an enormous polemic advantage in dealing with Gnostic theories. In opposition to the false Gnosis of the Gnostics, whose views he criticised with acuteness and vigor, but without heat or bitterness, he set forth a true Christian Gnosis, and thus furnished at once the answer and the antidote to the speculations of Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion. According to Clement the true Gnostic is not merely the knower, but the believer, who, through his faith, has become the knower.

"Knowledge," he says, "a perfecting of man as man, is consummated by acquaintance with divine things, in character, life, and word, accordant and conformable to itself and to the divine Word. For by it faith is perfected, inasmuch as it is solely by it that the believer becomes perfect. Faith is an internal good, and without searching for God, confesses His existence, and glorifies Him as existent. Whence by starting from this faith, and being developed by it, through the grace of God, the knowledge respecting Him is to be acquired as far as possible."

In another place he thus, more explicitly, sets forth his idea of the intimate relation of faith to knowledge: —

"Faith is then, so to speak, a comprehensive knowledge of the essentials; and knowledge is the strong and sure demonstration of what is received by faith, built upon faith by the Lord's teaching, conveying [the soul] on to infallibility, science, and comprehension. And, in my view, the first saving change is that from heathenism to faith, as I said before; and the second, that from faith to knowledge. And the latter, terminating in love, thereafter gives the loving to the loved, that which knows to that which is known. And, perchance, such an one has already attained the condition 'of being equal to the angels.'"

That which, perhaps, is most characteristic of Clement's function as an interpreter of the Christian faith is his thought of the Incarnation, — the indwelling Word, — "as the crown and consummation of the whole history of the world." With his idea of the Incarnation, or the immanent Word, was inseparably joined his idea of the world as belonging, not to the powers of darkness, but to God, and of human nature as a product of the divine wisdom and love. He rejects entirely the Gnostic ideas with respect to the origin and nature of evil, and, indeed, does not concern himself specially with these questions. He knows nothing of that doctrine of the fall of man in Adam which fills so prominent a place in the later Latin theology, and, by his principle of the freedom of the will, he escapes the fatalism of Gnostic and Manichæan thought, into which Augustine, de-

spite his conversion from Manichæism, fell, or, perhaps we should rather say, from which he never entirely freed himself.

Of "total depravity" Clement knows nothing, though he recognizes a moral inability which makes necessary both the quickening and the discipline of the soul by the Divine Spirit.

"Though men's actions," he says, "are ten thousand in number, the sources of all sin are but two, ignorance and inability. And both depend on ourselves; inasmuch as we will not learn, nor, on the other hand, restrain lust. And of these, the one is that, in consequence of which people do not judge well, and the other, that in consequence of which they cannot comply with right judgments. For neither will one who is deluded in his mind be able to act rightly, though perfectly able to do what he knows; nor, though capable of judging what is requisite, will he keep himself free from blame, if destitute of power in action. Consequently, then, there are assigned two kinds of correction applicable to both kinds of sin: for the one, knowledge and clear demonstration from the testimony of the Scriptures; and for the other, the training according to the Word, which is regulated by the discipline of faith and fear. And both develop into perfect love."

Punishment he regards as always remedial, never vindictive. God does not punish, he says, "for punishment is retaliation for evil. He chastises, however, for good to those who are chastised, collectively and individually."

Salvation, according to Clement, is a spiritually educative process, carried on within man by the indwelling Word. It is not, says Professor Allen, "a physical process, but an ethical growth, through union with God; divine knowledge is no mere speculative insight into the origin of things, but an ever-growing perception of the true character of God, as it is revealed in Christ." Clement's idea of salvation, therefore, excludes the element of expiation. He finds no opposition between divine justice and divine love, as did Marcion; there is therefore no necessity for expiation. The Incarnation is the real and only atonement, that is, the reconciliation of the world to Himself by the immanent God.

Clement's attitude toward asceticism was determined by his view of the world as God's world, and of the body as His temple. He therefore taught self-control, not self-annihilation; mortification of evil desires, not of the flesh. He says: —

"Those who run down created existence and vilify the body are wrong; not considering that the frame of man was formed erect for the contemplation of heaven, and that the organization of the senses tends to knowledge; and that the members and parts are arranged for good, not for pleasure. Whence this abode becomes receptive of the soul which is most precious to God; and is dignified with the Holy Spirit through the sanctification of soul and body, perfected with the perfection of the Saviour."

He speaks in one place of self-restraint as "God's greatest gift," but this self-restraint is always rational, and is motived by a love of righteousness which arises through the perception of the truth. "Virtue," he says, "is will in conformity to God and Christ in life, rightly adjusted to life everlasting. For the life of Christians, in which we are now trained, is a system of reasonable actions, — that is, of those things taught by the Word, — an unfailing energy which we have called faith."

With his view of God, and man, and the Incarnation, and faith, and the divine discipline, Clement consistently believed in the ultimate salvation of all men. I cannot take time now to enter at length into an exposition of Clement's thought on the outcome of the long drama of human history; but it is thus justly and happily indicated by Professor Allen: "His belief in the inherent worth of the individual soul, as constituted after the divine image, would not allow him to succumb to the thought that man was created practically an animal only, with the possibility attached of some time receiving an immortal spirit in virtue of his own exertions; or, on the other hand, that any soul could continue forever to resist the force of redeeming love. Somehow and somewhere, in the long run of ages, that love must prove mightier than sin and death, and vindicate its power in one universal triumph."

The largeness of Clement's thought and the

breadth of his outlook upon the world and upon the future justify the application to him by Dr. Bigg of the epithet "Pauline." Certainly down to the time of Clement very little trace of real Paulinism can be found except, indeed, among the Gnostics.

Clement's successor was ORIGEN, the most famous name in the Christian Church antecedent to Augustine, and the greatest of the early teachers. His full name was Origenes Adamantius. He was born in Alexandria, of Christian parents, in 185 A. D. His name, which means "born of Or," or Horus, the Egyptian god of light, suggests that he was by race an Egyptian, or Copt, though his father bore the Greek name Leonides. He was the eldest of seven sons. His father, who was a teacher of rhetoric, gave him a liberal education in Greek learning and, especially, in the Christian Scriptures, portions of which he required him daily to commit to memory. The boy was an eager student, with an alert and inquiring mind, and he often put troubling questions to his father. This questioning spirit was sometimes rebuked, but at night the father would go, and, uncovering his boy as he slept, would reverently kiss his breast, "as a shrine consecrated by the divine Spirit," and thank God for giving him such a son.

Very early Origen entered the Catechetical school, where he imbibed the intellectual spirit of

his great master, Clement. When he was seventeen years old, in 202, his father, Leonides, became a victim of the persecution under Septimius Severus, and was thrown into prison. Origen ardently desired to share his fate. His mother implored him not to rush upon martyrdom, but, seeing him resolved upon his course, she hid his clothes, and so compelled him to remain in the house. The boy wrote his father a letter, encouraging him to stand fast in his faith, and saying, "Take heed, father, not to change thy mind on account of us." Leonides was put to death, his property was confiscated, and Origen was left to support his mother and his six younger brothers. For a time he received help from a wealthy lady of Alexandria, who took him in. This lady had as her chaplain a certain Paul of Antioch, whom she had adopted as a son. Paul was, as Eusebius tells us, "an advocate of the heretics then existing at Alexandria;" that is, he was a Gnostic. Origen, who abominated Paul's heretical doctrines, was uncomfortable in what he felt to be a compromising situation, and he resolved to leave it and support himself and his family by teaching grammar. He immediately acted on his resolution, and soon was very successful in his vocation, attracting to himself many disciples, among whom were Plutarch, soon afterwards a martyr to the faith, and Heraclas, who later became bishop of Alexandria. During that troublous time, while persecution was raging in the

city, he fearlessly gave aid and comfort to the persecuted, whom he publicly saluted with the kiss of peace. The multitude, infuriated by his boldness, sought to put him to death, and he escaped only by fleeing from house to house.

When Origen was scarcely eighteen years old, Demetrius, at that time bishop of Alexandria, who, though he was a stern and unlettered man, had observed and appreciated the abilities of the young student, called him to the head of the Catechetical school. Previous to this time he had accumulated, chiefly by his own labor, a considerable library, having transcribed with his own hand many copies of classic and other manuscripts. Refusing all remuneration for his teaching, he sold his library for an income of four obols (twelve cents) a day, on which he lived for many years, steadily declining the contributions offered by his friends. He devoted himself to a life of rigorous self-denial and toil. He had early exhibited a tendency towards a passionate asceticism; now he gave himself to teaching by day and to study by night, satisfied himself with one coat, fasted much and took his little sleep on the ground.[1] For twelve or thirteen

[1] There seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the generally received opinion that, at this time, Origen, with sincere but mistaken zeal, applied to himself literally the words of Christ in Matthew xix. 12. This act, according to the ecclesiastical ideas of the times, disqualified him for clerical office, and it partly explains the persistence of Demetrius in accomplishing his degradation from the pres-

years he labored with unflagging zeal and great success as head of the school.

About 213, during the episcopate of Zephyrinus in Rome (202–217), he visited the capital of the empire. On his return to his work in the school he transferred the care of the younger pupils, the catechumens, to Heraclas, whom he chose as an assistant, and devoted himself to the advanced pupils and to Biblical study. Being hampered, in his controversy with the Jews, by his ignorance of Hebrew, he resolved to learn that language, which he did, though he never attained great proficiency in it. He also sought a fuller acquaintance with Grecian literature and with the current phases of philosophic thought, and for this purpose attended the lectures of Ammonius Saccas, the reputed founder of the Neo-Platonic school, of which afterwards the lamented Hypatia was so beautiful and so distinguished a representative. Origen's fame spread far and wide. He travelled much, enlightening Christians and confirming them in the martyr spirit, and also confuting heretics, in which he generally was successful.

About this time his reputation had grown so great that the Roman governor of the province of Arabia requested Demetrius and the governor of Egypt to send Origen to him.

byterate. In his later life Origen developed more rational views of Scripture teaching, and probably regretted his youthful rashness.

In 215 Caracalla was severely lampooned in Alexandria for the murder of his brother Geta. In an outburst of fury the half-mad emperor began to take bloody reprisals of the Alexandrians. Origen left the city and went to Palestine, where he visited his friend, Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and then to Cæsarea, where he was welcomed by another friend, Theoctistus. These two men so admired Origen that they requested him to expound the Scriptures publicly in their presence; which he did, though he was not ordained. Demetrius, who was very much of an ecclesiastic, hearing of this, was indignant that a layman should speak in public before bishops, and promptly recalled Origen. It was probably about this time that, in response to an invitation from Julia Mammæa, the mother of Alexander Severus, he paid a visit to the empress-dowager, who seems to have been sojourning then in Alexandria. As an indication of the honor in which he was held, it is recorded that he was attended by a military escort furnished by his imperial hostess.

Not long after his return to Alexandria Origen entered upon a new form of work, namely, the written exposition of the Scriptures. Up to this time he had written very little, but a wealthy Alexandrian, by name Ambrosius, whom he had converted from Valentinian Gnosticism, urged him to write, and supplied him with the necessary money for the transcription and publication of his works.

This friend provided him with seven stenographers and the same number of caligraphists. Eusebius says that Ambrosius furnished "the most ample supplies of all necessary means; for he [that is, Origen] had more than seven amanuenses, when he dictated, who relieved each other at appointed times. He had not fewer copyists, as also girls, who were well exercised in more elegant writing. For all which, Ambrose furnished an abundant supply of all the necessary expense." Ambrose affords an example that is quite worthy of imitation by wealthy laymen in our own day.

Owing to the increasing proficiency of Heraclas, Origen was now able to withdraw himself in a large measure from the charge of the school, and to devote himself to his literary occupations. His writings, says Westcott, "marked him out more decisively than before as a teacher in the Church even more than in the school." His work, however, raised new difficulties in his path. His "First Principles," continues Westcott, "made an epoch in Christian speculation, as the 'Commentary on St. John' made an epoch in Christian interpretation."

Demetrius began to be jealous of the growing power and reputation of this layman, and Origen's position began to grow uncomfortable. About 226 or 228, an opportunity came to change, for a time at least, his relations. He was invited to Greece to aid in settling some troubles arising from heresies, and, being furnished with "commendatory letters,"

he set out on his journey, passing, on his way, through Palestine, where he paused for a time. While he was there, Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Cæsarea consecrated him as a presbyter. He then continued his journey to Greece, visiting Ephesus on the way, and spent some time at Athens. About 230 he returned to find Demetrius in a rage, and a storm of ecclesiastical reprobation ready to burst upon him. A synod of Egyptian bishops, in which also the presbyters under Demetrius were given seats, pronounced Origen unworthy of the office of catechist, probably because of his violation of ecclesiastical discipline, and excommunicated him from the church in Alexandria; but it did not venture to depose him from the dignity of presbyter. Demetrius was not satisfied; he called a second synod of bishops and degraded Origen from the office of presbyter, and sent an encyclical letter announcing the action of the synod.[1] The churches in Palestine, Phœnicia, Arabia, and Achaia disregarded the letter and the episcopal action. In Alexandria, the hierarchical party, which was now dominant, had long been opposed to Origen. He was too large and too free a man to be enclosed within the lines of their conception of a Christian teacher. It is significant that the church in Rome approved the action of Demetrius.

Previous to the second synod Origen saw that he

[1] See note on page 362.

must retire before the storm, and he turned over the entire charge of the Catechetical school to Heraclas and withdrew from Alexandria, never to return. He went to Cæsarea, where he "found ungrudging sympathy and help for his manifold labors." Says Westcott: "Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Cæsarea remained devoted to him; and Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia was no less zealous in seeking his instruction. Ambrosius was with him to stimulate and maintain his literary efforts." Here he established a school which almost rivalled in fame the school in Alexandria, and in which he labored for more than twenty years. For a little time between 235 and 237 his labors were interrupted by the persecution which broke out under Maximin, and he was obliged to go into concealment in Cappadocia, at least during part of the time, in the house of Juliana, a Christian lady who was the heiress of Symmachus, the Ebionite translator of the Septuagint. While here he wrote his "Exhortation to Martyrdom" for the consolation of Ambrosius and Protoctetus, who were suffering imprisonment on account of the faith. On the death of Maximin these friends were liberated, and Origen returned to Cæsarea.

Of Origen's work as a teacher in Cæsarea, an interesting and eloquent account was given by his most distinguished pupil, Gregory Thaumaturgus, in a farewell address which the latter delivered on the occasion of his final departure from the school.

It shows, with touching devotion, the way in which the master had turned him from his purpose to study Roman law, and had led him into the service of the gospel, kindling in his breast a love for the Holy Word. Origen now devoted himself mainly to exegetical studies. His labors were unremitting. In one of his letters he says: —

"The work of correction leaves us no time for supper, or, after supper, for exercise and repose. Even at these times we are compelled to debate questions of interpretation and to emend MSS. Even the night cannot be given up altogether to the needful refreshment of sleep, for our discussions extend far into the evening. I say nothing about our morning labor, continued from dawn to the ninth or tenth hour; for all earnest students devote this time to study of the Scriptures and reading."

Although confining himself for the most part to his labors in Cæsarea, Origen made an occasional visit to other places, — to Jerusalem, to Jericho, and to Sidon. He also visited Athens, and Bostra in Arabia. In the latter place he restored Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, from errors into which he had fallen on the subject of the Incarnation. He had now attained the full measure of his powers. From about 245, when he was sixty years old, he allowed his oral expositions of Scripture to be taken down in shorthand, and during the succeeding four or five years he produced most of the homilies which have been preserved. His works pro-

duced during this period show the greatest sobriety and ripest maturity of his mind, such as we see in the "Commentary on St. Matthew" and the writing entitled "Against Celsus." In 250 the persecution under Decius broke out, and many Christians in Syria were victims. Alexander of Jerusalem was thrown into prison, where he died. Origen was arrested and taken to Tyre, where he was subjected to the torture of chains, the iron collar, and the rack. His constancy was unshaken through all his sufferings. On the death of Decius, in 251, he was set free, but his health was broken by the hardships through which he had passed, and by his many years of incessant labor, and in 254, at the age of sixty-nine, he died at Tyre, where he was buried. When, later, a cathedral, named after the Holy Sepulchre, was built there, his body was enclosed in the wall behind the high altar, and his tomb was honored as long as the city survived. Long after the city was destroyed by the Saracens, his name was still remembered, and, even in modern times, the tradition of his greatness still lingers amidst the ruins. "It is said that the natives point out the spot where 'Oriunus' lies under a vault, the relic of an ancient church now covered by their huts."

In his personal character Origen was a singularly pure and noble man; though the inheritor of a fiery and passionate nature, he was meek and patient under suffering and opposition. Unlike Tertullian,

he reacted from his earlier extreme, ascetical views, and grew steadily in breadth of sympathy and in reasonableness of judgment. He had a mind of great speculative power and acuteness, which was enriched with prodigious learning. It is said that he produced no less than six thousand writings, a statement which, though probably exaggerated, witnesses to the remarkable fertility of his mind and to the extent of his labors.

Of his numerous writings, nearly fifty volumes, too costly for reproduction, perished by fire at the capture of Cæsarea by the Arabs in 653. Of his extant works I can notice but two or three. The most extensive of these, and the one upon which his fame as a critic mainly rests, is the "Hexapla." This was an edition of the Old Testament Scriptures in which were arranged in parallel columns (1) The Hebrew text of the Old Testament, (2) The same in Greek letters, (3) The Version of Aquila, (4) The Version of Symmachus, (5) The text of the Septuagint, and (6) The Version of Theodotion. In giving an account of the origin of this colossal work, Dr. Bigg says: —

"In controversy with the Jews the Christian disputant was constantly baffled by the retort, that the passages on which he relied were not found, or were otherwise expressed, in the Hebrew. Several new translations or recensions of the whole or part of the LXX. had been produced, in which the discrepancies of the Alexandrine Version from the original were brought into strong relief.

Origen saw clearly the whole of the difficulties involved, and with characteristic grandeur and fearlessness determined upon producing an edition of the Old Testament that should exhibit in parallel columns the Hebrew text and the rival versions, thus bringing before the eye of the inquirer, in one view, the whole of the evidence attainable. . . . This gigantic and costly scheme was rendered feasible by the munificence, and facilitated by the active co-operation, of Ambrosius."

His work on "First Principles" (De Principiis), written in 228, contains Origen's main philosophical and theological principles. Of this only fragments have survived in the original Greek, but we have a Latin translation, or paraphrase, of the whole by Rufinus.

The book "Against Celsus" (Contra Celsum) is a work of great ability and of high apologetic value. Its value is enhanced by the fact that it contains in quotations almost the whole of Celsus' acute attack on Christianity. This work, in answer to Celsus, was undertaken by Origen, at the request of his friend Ambrosius. We know nothing with certainty concerning the personal history of Celsus, and apparently Origen knew as little as do we. His book entitled "A True Discourse" (Ἀληθὴς Λόγος), evidently was the work of a Platonist (Origen mistakenly calls him an Epicurean), who wrote probably as early as the time of Marcus Aurelius, though Ueberweg puts the date as late as 200. He combated Christianity

partly from the Jewish and partly from his own philosophic point of view, "reducing its historical basis to an abortive attempt at insurrection, and opposing to the Christian idea of forbearing love the idea of justice; to faith in the redemption of humanity, faith in an eternal, rational order of the universe; to the doctrine of God Incarnate, the idea of the remoteness of God, whose influence on earthly things is exerted only indirectly; and to faith in the resurrection of the body, the doctrine of the nothingness of matter and of the future existence of the soul alone." Every essential form of objection to Christianity that has been presented up to the present time is to be found, germinally at least, in Celsus. He was well furnished for his attack. He had travelled widely, and conversed with representatives of every shade of religious belief, including many Christians. He was familiar with the four Gospels and Genesis and Exodus, and had some acquaintance with the writings of the prophets and with the apostolic epistles; he had considerable acquaintance also with Gnostic and Judaistic literature.

In his answer, which was written in his later years (244–249), and represents, therefore, the maturity of his powers and his more sober and evangelic thought, Origen covers all the ground covered by previous apologists, — the character of Christians and the historicity of Christianity, — and enters on the wider domain of the relation of

Christianity to philosophy, to the pagan religions, and to national life. It is a comprehensive work, in which the gauntlet is taken up for Christianity against attack on critical, historical, philosophical, and political grounds. There is no time now to give an analysis of the work. He who desires to read it may easily do so in an English translation, and he will find it much the most interesting, to the ordinary reader, of all Origen's extant works.

I quote a few passages to show the sobriety and dignity of Origen's style, the calmness and clearness of his judgment, and the breadth and sanity of his thought. In commendation of Jesus' doctrine as a doctrine of salvation, he says: —

"Both Jesus Himself and His disciples desired that His followers should believe not merely in His Godhead and miracles, as if He had not also been a partaker of human nature, and had assumed the human flesh which 'lusteth against the Spirit;' but they saw also that the power which had descended into human nature, and into the midst of human miseries, and which had assumed a human soul and body, contributed through faith, along with its divine elements, to the salvation of believers, when they see that from Him there began the union of the Divine with the human nature, in order that the human, by communion with the Divine, might rise to be divine, not in Jesus alone, but in all those who not only believe, but enter upon the life which Jesus taught, and which elevates to friendship with God and communion with Him every one who lives according to the precepts of Jesus."

In answer to Celsus' charge, which he pronounces malicious, that Christians assert that "God will receive the unrighteous man if he humble himself on account of his wickedness, but that He will not receive the righteous man, although he look up to Him, [adorned] with virtue from the beginning," he replies: —

"Now we assert that it is impossible for a man to look up to God [adorned] with virtue from the beginning. For wickedness must necessarily first exist in men. As Paul also says, 'When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.' Moreover, we do not teach regarding the unrighteous man, that it is sufficient for him to humble himself on account of his wickedness, in order to his being accepted by God, but that God will accept him if, after passing condemnation upon himself for his past conduct, he walk humbly on account of it, and in a becoming manner for the time to come."

In reply to Celsus' criticism that it is "wicked and impious" to believe that "the great God should become a slave or suffer death," as was implied in the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, Origen says with great dignity and in the most excellent spirit: —

"If we consider Jesus in relation to the divinity that was in Him, the things which He did in this capacity present nothing to offend our ideas of God, nothing but what is holy; and if we consider Him as man, distinguished beyond all other men by an intimate communion with the Eternal Word, with absolute Wisdom, He suf-

fered as one who was wise and perfect, whatever it behooved Him to suffer who did all for the good of the human race, yea, even for the good of all intelligent beings. And there is nothing absurd in a man having died, and in his death being not only an example of death endured for the sake of piety, but also the first blow in the conflict which is to overthrow the power of that evil spirit, the devil, who had obtained dominion over the whole world. For we have signs and pledges of the destruction of his empire, in those who through the coming of Christ are everywhere escaping from the power of demons, and who, after their deliverance from this bondage in which they were held, consecrate themselves to God, and earnestly devote themselves day by day to advancement in a life of piety."

Contrasting the prayers of Christians to God with the prayers of even philosophic heathens to images of the gods, Origen says: —

"A Christian, even of the common people, is assured that every place forms part of the universe, and that the whole universe is God's temple. In whatever part of the world he is, he prays; but he rises above the universe, 'shutting the eyes of sense, and raising upwards the eyes of the soul.' And he stops not at the vault of heaven; but passing in thought beyond the heavens, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, and having thus as it were gone beyond the visible universe, he offers prayers to God. But he prays for no trivial blessings, for he has learnt from Jesus to seek for nothing small or mean, that is, sensible objects, but to ask only for what is great and truly divine; and these things God grants to us, to

lead us to that blessedness which is found only with Him through His Son, the Word, who is God."

In his conception of the Christian life, Origen, like Clement, believed profoundly in Gnosis, as the result and fulfilment of faith; but instead of the term "Gnosis," he uses the term "Wisdom." In his interpretations of Scripture, he followed Philo and his school in the use of allegorism. This, however, was far more characteristic of his earlier than of his later work; in respect to allegorism, as well as asceticism, he changed to a more rational position. In his "First Principles," one of his earliest works, he thus defines and defends the use of allegorism in interpreting Scripture: "For as man consists of body, and soul, and spirit, so in the same way does Scripture, which has been arranged to be given by God for the salvation of men." He maintains that there are in Scripture, in general, three senses, the literal, the moral, and the spiritual; the first he identifies with the body, the second with the soul, and the third with the spirit. For example, in the parable of the mustard seed, the grain of mustard is, first, simply the seed, then it is faith, and then it is the Kingdom of Heaven. The phrase, "little foxes," in the Song of Songs, means, in the second sense, sins of individuals, and, in the third sense, heresies which are distracting the Church. Not all passages are susceptible of this three-fold treatment, and there are

some, the entire significance of which lies in their mystical sense.

Concerning the latter he says: —

"But since, if the usefulness of the legislation, and the sequence and beauty of the history, were universally evident of themselves, we should not believe that any other thing could be understood in the Scriptures save what was obvious, the word of God has arranged that certain stumbling-blocks, as it were, and offences and impossibilities, should be introduced into the midst of the law and the history, in order that we may not, through being drawn away in all directions by the merely attractive nature of the language, either altogether fall away from the [true] doctrines, as learning nothing worthy of God, or, by not departing from the letter, come to the knowledge of nothing more divine. And this also we must know, that the principal aim being to announce the 'spiritual' connection in those things that are done, and that ought to be done, where the Word found that things done according to the history could be adapted to these mystical senses, He made use of them, concealing from the multitude the deeper meaning; but where, in the narrative of the development of supersensual things, there did not follow the performance of those certain events, which was already indicated by the mystical meaning, the Scripture interwove in the history some event that did not take place; sometimes what could not have happened; sometimes what could, but did not. And sometimes a few words are interpolated which are not true in their literal acceptation, and sometimes a larger number. . . . And at other times impossibilities are recorded for the sake of the more skilful

and inquisitive, in order that they may give themselves to the toil of investigating what is written, and thus attain to a becoming conviction of the manner in which a meaning worthy of God must be sought out in such subjects."

The fame of Origen has been greater than that of Clement, his master, or, indeed, that of any other of the early Fathers, both because of the greater scope of his learning and intellectual force, and because of his relation to the Trinitarian controversy, which, though as yet scarcely begun, soon filled the whole theological horizon of the Church. Substantially in sympathy with Clement, Origen differed from him in practically adopting the methods of the Neo-Platonists; though, notwithstanding his use of these, he rested fundamentally in his teaching on the Christian revelation, and, quite as strongly as Clement, held to the truth of the Incarnation, the immanent God. It must be said also that, however far from "the simplicity of Christ" some of his speculations may seem to have carried him, he was always a humble and fervent believer in Jesus.

He was the first who elaborated a complete theological system. His conception of God, the absolute Deity, had a certain resemblance to the conceptions both of the Gnostics and the Neo-Platonists. Gnosticism removed God to an infinite distance from the material universe; Neo-Platonism sought to bring God and man together in conscious experience, but it was hampered by the Gnostic idea

which it seemed incapable of shaking off. Origen, though he did not entirely free himself from the fundamental notion of the Gnostics and the Neo-Platonists, of the infinite remoteness and inaccessibleness of the absolute God, yet was held to a Christian, and a sound theological, position by his immovable conviction of the divine immanence in the world and in humanity. His contribution to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity was large, although he did not by any means apprehend the entire scope of the problem. Before the thinker who sought to formulate a rational conception of God there lay the alternative of a multiplicity of Divine Beings, which is polytheism, whether the gods be three or three thousand in number, or a simple oneness of God, which is bald deism. Origen maintained that God is omniscient, omnipresent, immutable, and incomprehensible, yet not impassible, for He has love. The Son, or Divine Word, is derived from the Father, and yet is co-eternal with Him. He did not begin to be, but is eternally begotten. The Son is thus co-eternal and in some real sense co-equal with the Father. Says Origen: —

"There never can have been a time when He was not. For when was that God, whom St. John calls the Light, destitute of the radiance of His proper glory, so that a man may dare to ascribe a beginning of existence to the Son? . . . Let a man, who ventures to say there was a time when the Son was not, consider that this is all one with saying

there was a time when Wisdom was not, the Word was not, the Life was not."

Yet the Word is not absolutely identical and co-extensive with the Father. He is the "Splendor of the Divine Glory, the Image of the Father's Person;" the Father is the "Fountain" from which the Son's divinity is drawn; in other words, the Son answers to the Father as Effect to Cause; the Son is therefore subordinate to the Father.

Origen's doctrine of the eternally generated Son pointed the way for Christian thought, but his idea of subordination left open the door for Arianism.

Of the Holy Spirit Origen declares that He is co-eternal with the Father and the Son, and yet, like the Son, He is subordinate to the Father. As the Son is derived from the Father, so the Holy Spirit, in turn, is derived from the Son. As the Son is the personification of divine reason, the Spirit is the personification and hypostasis of divine holiness. He is the spring of all spiritual gifts. I quote from Dr. Bigg the succinct statement: "The Father gives being to all that exists; the Son imparts reason, Logos, to all that is capable of it; the Holy Ghost works life in those that believe."

We have thus in Origen's teaching a doctrine of the Trinity, but it is not the doctrine which finally became dominant in the Church. As I have already intimated, he came too early to grasp the full significance of the problem with

which Athanasius was called to deal, and his teaching was susceptible of such interpretation that his support was claimed on both sides of the great controversy.

In his theory of the various orders of created beings Origen approached Gnosticism. His hierarchy of spirits corresponds in some degree to the Gnostic series of Æons. Spirits have the same substance as God, but they do not possess good as an essential and inherent part of their being; they acquire it by their own determination. This moral determination is always within their power. A good angel may become an evil angel, and an evil angel may become a good angel. Like Clement, only more fully than he, Origen held to the freedom of the will, powerfully opposing the fatalism and predestinationism of Gnostic thought, and supporting his doctrines by copious citations of Scripture and by acute argument. All created spirits come into being free to determine their own character, and matter was created to serve as an envelope to the soul and to give outward form to moral determinations. In order, apparently, to meet certain exigencies of his system, he held to the Platonic idea of the preexistence of human souls, but he denied metempsychosis. Man's condition in this world is the result of a fall precedent to his entrance into this world. Origen's idea of original sin is entirely unlike that of later theologians. He was not, however,

always consistent, nor is his thought always perfectly clear. He seems to have held that the story of the fall in Genesis is a pure allegory: Adam represents man in his pre-mundane state, and Adam's sin is a symbolical representation of man's primal defection from God. He suggests that the coats of skins with which the Lord clothed Adam and Eve may represent the bodies in which fallen angels were incarnated on their expulsion from the spiritual Paradise.

In the hierarchy of spiritual beings man comes midway; above him are the angels, and below him are the demons, or fallen angels, who have attained varying degrees of sinfulness. Every man in this world has his accompanying demon and good angel. By the former he is enticed to sin, but he may overcome the demons and hold their power in check by righteous action; by the good angel he is helped in proportion as he himself strives after that which is good.

Origen's system is thus not one of absolute individualism. Man is subject to the influences of good and evil about him in the world, and he maintains a certain solidarity with his race. Notwithstanding his fall, he has within him a spark of the divine life. His nature is threefold, consisting of spirit, soul, and body.

Origen maintains the doctrine of salvation through the power of the Word, who is joined to the human soul of Christ and becomes incarnate.

"Who else," he asks, "is able to save and conduct the soul of man to the God of all things, save God the Word, who, 'being in the beginning with God,' became flesh for the sake of those who had cleaved to the flesh, and had become as flesh, that He might be received by those who could not behold Him, inasmuch as He was the Word, and was with God and was God? And discoursing in human form, and announcing Himself as flesh, He calls to Himself those who are flesh, that He may in the first place cause them to be transformed according to the Word that was made flesh, and afterwards may lead them upwards to behold Him as He was before He became flesh."

Origen, like Clement, has no doctrine of expiation, in the strict sense of the term. The Incarnate Word becomes our Ransom and in some sense our Propitiation. He makes of Himself a world-sacrifice, but His death is not an expiation by which God is propitiated in the sense of the later theology; it is a ransom offered to Satan; and yet, through that very death, Satan himself is overcome and defrauded of his victims. Origen is not thoroughly consistent here; in one place he maintains that martyrs by their death overcome the powers of evil in a way similar to Christ's triumph over Satan by His death, but he also, and with great force, maintains that the death of Christ was an unparalleled exhibition and achievement of divine Love.

The final redemptive process fulfilled by the Divine Word is the salvation of all. Hell is a

purifying fire; even Satan himself, and all the fallen angels, will be saved, and the triumph of infinite Love will be complete. Of future punishment Origen says: "The Lord is like a refiner's fire."

"It is certain that the fire which is prepared for sinners awaits us, and we shall go into that fire, wherein God will try each man's work of what kind it is. . . . Even if it be a Paul or a Peter, he shall come into that fire, but such are they of whom it is written, 'though thou pass through the fire, the flame shall not scorch thee.' The holy and the just are cleansed, like Aaron and Isaiah, with coals from off the altar. But sinners, 'among whom I count myself,' must be purged with another fire. This is not of the altar, it is not the Lord's, but is kindled by the sinner himself within his own heart. Its fuel is our own evil, the wood, the hay, the straw, sins graver or lighter, which we have built upon the foundation laid by Christ. Anger, envy, remorse, these rack men even in this life with anguish so intolerable, that many perish by their own hand rather than bear their torments longer. How much fiercer will be the smart, when the soul in the light of eternity surveys the history of all its wickedness written in indelible characters upon its own texture; when it is 'sawn asunder' by the pangs which attend the separation of the guilty passions from the pure spirit; when it bewails in 'outer darkness' its banishment from Him, who is the Light and the Life."

Of Origen's successors there is space here to say but little. HERACLAS, who was his assistant, and in

whose hands he left the school when he retired from Alexandria, retained the headship of the school but a short time. On the death of Demetrius, in 233, Heraclas was chosen bishop of Alexandria, and occupied the episcopal seat until his death in 248. That he was a man of learning and intellectual power is shown by the fact that Origen committed to him the care of the school, and also by the fact that the distinguished scholar, Julius Africanus, paid him a visit on account of his celebrity; but no works of his have survived, and he seems not to have mingled much, if any, in the great theological discussions of his time.

On the election of Heraclas to the episcopate, DIONYSIUS was called to the head of the school. He was born, near the end of the second century, of an honorable and wealthy, but heathen, family. He became a Christian through reading the epistles of St. Paul, and was baptized by Demetrius. By his conversion, like St. Paul, he abandoned his worldly prospects, "counting all things but loss that he might win Christ." Dionysius was the most distinguished of Origen's Alexandrian pupils, and always remained faithful to the teachings of his master. In 248 he was made bishop of Alexandria, to succeed Heraclas, but he seems to have retained the headship of the Catechetical school to the end of his life. He suffered much in the persecutions by Decius and Valerian,

under the former barely escaping with his life through the timely courage of a friend, and under the latter being sent into exile. In 260, however, under Gallienus he was allowed to return, and remained at his post through war, pestilence, and famine, until his death in 265. As an administrator he showed wisdom and moderation, dealing gently with the "lapsed." In theology he followed Origen, but in controverting Sabellianism he laid himself open to the charge of Tritheism. The charge, however, was unjust, as Athanasius afterwards showed.

Dionysius was openly sympathetic with Origen through all the latter's misfortunes, and felt great sorrow at his death. He wrote a book, "Concerning Martyrdom," which he dedicated to Origen a short time before Origen's death. He wrote voluminously, but of both his treatises and his numerous letters only fragments remain. Of his writings Westcott says: They "repay careful study. They are uniformly inspired by the sympathy and large-heartedness which he showed in practice. His criticism of the style of the Apocalypse is perhaps unique among early writings for clearness and scholarly precision." Of the latter a specimen has been preserved for us in the pages of Eusebius.

Following Dionysius was PIERIUS, who conducted the school for some years from 265, but afterwards

gave it up and retired to Rome. He was eminent for his voluntary poverty, his knowledge of philosophy, and his power in the public exposition of the Scriptures. His eloquence won for him the title of "the younger Origen." On one Easter eve, it is said, he gave a discourse on Hosea to which the people listened until after midnight. His works have perished, and he probably suffered martyrdom under Diocletian.

We hear little more of the Catechetical school in Alexandria, though it continued to exist until near the end of the fourth century. It attained the zenith of its power under Clement and Origen, but after these great masters passed away it rapidly declined in influence.

The most brilliant of Origen's pupils in Cæsarea was GREGORY, known in ecclesiastical history as Gregory Thaumaturgus. He was a native of Pontus, and was born about 210. In his youth he purposed to devote himself to the study of Roman law. While on his way to the famous school of jurisprudence at Berytus, in Syria, he visited Cæsarea, where he fell into the hands of Origen, under whose influence he became a fervent Christian, and in whose school he remained five years. On his return to his home in Pontus he was chosen bishop of Neo-Cæsarea (about 240), and filled his office with exceptional ability until his death in 270. He was a man not only of

learning, but also of peculiar force of character and weight of judgment. To his eloquent panegyric on Origen we are indebted for the fullest knowledge we possess of the master's spirit and method in teaching. No pupil drank more deeply of that spirit than Gregory. In his diocese he found at the beginning only seventeen Christians, but so ardent was his zeal and so great and successful were his labors that at his death there were scarcely as many heathen. It is not to be wondered at that about his name there gathered, later, many legends of his miraculous deeds, — hence his name, Thaumaturgus, which means wonder-worker.

Gregory's tendency was practical rather than speculative, yet he took part in the controversies of his time and wrote several works which are conspicuous for their modesty and practical sense as well as for their philosophical tone. Many heretical writings were afterwards attached to his name, but, like the miracles, they are spurious. His panegyric on Origen is a piece of noble and generous eloquence.

As specimens of Gregory's spirit and style I quote several paragraphs. Early in his discourse he likens Origen to a skilful gardener dealing with a "field unwrought and altogether unfertile, . . . or, . . . not utterly barren or unproductive, but . . . waste and neglected, and stiff and untractable with thorns and wild shrubs."

"In suchwise, then," he says, "and with such a disposition did he receive us at first; and surveying us, as it were, with a husbandman's skill, and gauging us thoroughly, and not confining his notice to those things only which are patent to the eye of all, and which are looked upon in open light, but penetrating into us more deeply, and probing what is most inward in us, he put us to the question, and made propositions to us, and listened to us in our replies; and whenever he thereby detected anything in us not wholly fruitless and profitless and waste, he set about clearing the soil, and turning it up and irrigating it, and putting all things in movement, and brought his whole skill and care to bear on us, and wrought upon our mind. And thorns and thistles, and every kind of wild herb or plant which our mind . . . yielded and produced in its uncultured luxuriance and native wildness, he cut out and thoroughly removed by the processes of refutation and prohibition."

Here, for a moment, Gregory changes the figure, and speaks of Origen as "assailing us in the genuine Socratic fashion, and again upsetting us by his argumentation whenever he saw us getting restive under him, like so many unbroken steeds, and springing out of the course and galloping madly about at random, until with a strange kind of persuasiveness and constraint he reduced us to a state of quietude under him by his discourse, which acted like a bridle in our mouth."

After speaking of Origen's treatment of dialectics, he turns to natural philosophy, and then says: —

"What need is there now to speak of the sacred mathematics, viz. geometry, so precious to all and above all controversy, and astronomy, whose course is on high? These different studies he imprinted on our understandings, training us in them, or calling them into our mind, or doing with us something else which I know not how to designate rightly. And the one he presented lucidly as the immutable ground-work and secure foundation of all, namely geometry; and by the other, namely astronomy, he lifted us up to the things that are highest above us, while he made heaven passable to us by the help of each of these sciences, as though they were ladders reaching the skies."

Gregory thus sums up Origen's work in behalf of his pupils:—

"This admirable man, this friend and advocate of the virtues, has long ago done for us perhaps all that it lay in his power to do for us, in making us lovers of virtue, who should love it with the most ardent affection. And by his own virtue he created in us a love at once for the beauty of righteousness, the golden face of which in truth was shown to us by him; and for prudence, which is worthy of being sought by all; and for the true wisdom, which is most delectable; and for temperance, the heavenly virtue which forms the sound constitution of the soul, and brings peace to all who possess it; and for manliness, that most admirable grace; and for patience, that virtue peculiarly ours; and, above all, for piety, which men rightly designate when they call it the mother of the virtues. . . . And the end of all I consider to be nothing but this: By the pure mind make thyself like to

God, that thou mayest draw near to Him, and abide in Him."

The Panegyric concludes with this affecting apostrophe to Origen: —

"But, O dear soul, arise thou and offer prayer, and now dismiss us; and as by thy holy instructions thou hast been our savior when we enjoyed thy fellowship, so save us still by thy prayers in our separation. Commend us and set us constantly before thee in prayer. Or rather commend us continually to that God who brought us to thee, giving thanks for all that has been granted us in the past, and imploring Him still to lead us by the hand in the future, and to stand ever by us, filling our mind with the understanding of His precepts, inspiring us with the godly fear of Himself, and vouchsafing us henceforward His choicest guidance. For when we are gone from thee, we shall not have the same liberty for obeying Him as was ours when we were with thee. Pray, therefore, that some encouragement may be conveyed to us from Him when we lose thy presence, and that He may send us a good conductor, some angel to be our comrade on the way. And entreat Him also to turn our course, and bring us back to thee again; for that is the one thing which above all else will effectually comfort us."

The teaching of Origen awakened prolonged controversy in the Church. Most of this arose after the Nicene Council, and the discussion of it can have no place here. One result of this controversy was the obscuration, for a long time, of Origen's true merits, but his day has come at last;

and now, through the labors of Christian scholars and thinkers, this great Christian thinker of the third century is indirectly influencing theological thought more powerfully, perhaps, than at any time since the rise of the passionate contentions that rent the Church during the fourth century.

THE FIRST ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.

WE have now reviewed, somewhat in detail, the history of more than two hundred and fifty years from the time when Jesus of Nazareth preached in Palestine and commissioned his little group of immediate followers to publish His gospel throughout the world. We have seen the Life imparted by Him, embodying itself in a Church which, from a purely democratic congregation, rapidly developed into an elaborate ecclesiastical organization that, in spite of all opposition, spread over almost the whole of the Roman empire. We have seen the Life expressing itself in a literature, which, at first artless and crude, slowly acquired force and finish of expression, as well as richness and variety of substance, until it ripened into the graceful apology of Athenagoras, the powerful polemic of Tertullian, and the comprehensive philosophic theology of Origen. We have seen the Life subliming humble fishermen into heroic advocates and martyrs of the faith; transforming self-indulgent heathens into self-denying Christians, whose unexampled virtue challenged the admiration, while it rebuked

the vices, of many peoples; and giving to strong men and weak women alike the courage and fortitude to meet and exhaust the assaults of every form of persecution. We have seen the handful of believers in Palestine becoming a host in every city of the empire, whose purity of life, elevation of character, and overflowing charities were writing a new and unparalleled chapter in the history of the moral progress of mankind. It remains for us, in this concluding lecture, to trace the movement of Christian thought into a great controversy, the issue of which was the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity. Around this doctrine the life of the Church organized itself for a struggle that continued with varying fortunes for three centuries, and that, on a smaller scale, has been renewed at different times during the succeeding centuries, even down to our own time.

The Trinitarian controversy arose in Alexandria in the second half of the third century. From the time of Philo there had been more or less speculation on the nature of God and on the relation subsisting between the Logos and the Father. In the Church, from the time of the apostles, there was a practical and unformulated Trinitarianism; that is, to both the Son and the Holy Spirit as well as to the Father attributes proper to deity were ascribed by Christian writers. When the speculative spirit arose in the Church, and there was an attempt to develop

a philosophical explanation of the divine nature, and a definition of the relations between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, various forms of thought arose which may be roughly classified as Monarchian on the one hand and Trinitarian on the other. Of the former, Praxeas in Asia Minor about 190, Beryllus of Bostra in Arabia in the first half of the third century, and Sabellius of Ptolemais in Egypt and Paul of Samosata a few years later, may be taken as representatives.

The subordinationism of Origen, while it was guarded by his doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son, seemed to some to point to an essentially Monistic conception of the divine nature. A distinct Trinitarian doctrine was not authoritatively formulated till the beginning of the fourth century; but during the preceding half-century, in which theological speculation was increasingly rife, the general movement of Christian thought was toward a sharper discrimination between the two general types which I have already designated. In 262 a controversy arose between Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome, in which the discussion turned on the nature and essence of the Logos, who had become incarnate in Christ, and on His relation to the Father. From this time the view that the Son was of the same essence as the Father, and equal with Him, rapidly gained adherents. Those who adopted this view, of course, soon saw the inconsistency

of maintaining subordinationism and they abandoned it. Their opponents held that Christ was subordinate to the Father, and they carried their idea so far as to maintain that He was not only not of the same substance as the Father, but that, although pre-existent, He had a beginning, and was therefore not co-eternal with the Father. A third party, consisting mainly of those whose thought was dominated by the influence of Origen, sought to reconcile these antagonistic forms of doctrine by propounding the view that the Son was of like substance with the Father and, though subordinate to the Father, was yet co-eternal with Him.

The discussion came to an acute crisis in the controversy between Arius, a presbyter, and Alexander, the metropolitan of Egypt; and this controversy led to the calling of the famous Council at Nicæa. Though this was the chief cause for the great Council, there were other causes also, namely, the Easter controversy, which divided the churches of Asia Minor from the other Eastern and the Western churches, on the proper time for the celebration of Easter, and the Meletian schism. Meletius was bishop of Lycopolis, and, of the Egyptian bishops, was next in rank to the bishop of Alexandria. Early in the Diocletian persecution Peter, who was bishop of Alexandria from 300 to 311, following illustrious examples, withdrew to a place of safety. During

his absence Meletius, who considered Peter's withdrawal a recreant abandonment of his post, assumed the primacy of Egypt and ordained presbyters in dioceses other than his own. Four Egyptian bishops, who had been imprisoned on account of their faith, sent to him a protest denouncing his action as a violation of the ecclesiastical rule that no bishop should intrude into the diocese of another. To this protest Meletius paid no attention. In a little time the four bishops were put to death by the officials of the emperor, and Meletius went to Alexandria, where he was welcomed by two malcontent presbyters, Isidore and Arius. One of his first acts was to depose the two visitors, or vicars-general, who had been commissioned by Peter, and to appoint in their places two others, one of whom was in prison and the other confined at hard labor in a mine. Peter, hearing of all this, wrote to the church in Alexandria, forbidding fellowship to Meletius until his action had been investigated. A synod of Egyptian bishops was summoned which deposed Meletius, but he had attached to himself a considerable number of followers and partisans, and these he drew off and formed into a rival body. Such in brief was the Meletian schism; its treatment by the Nicene Council will be considered later.

The main reason, however, for calling the council was the controversy over the Trinity. It

will subserve clearness if I give some account of the rise of this controversy and the personalities engaged in it.

Alexander had succeeded to Achillas in the episcopate of Alexandria in 313. He was a man already past middle life, of kindly and gentle disposition, but also with considerable force of character. Arius, his antagonist, was born in Libya about 256, and educated under Lucian in Antioch. When he came to Alexandria is not known, but he was ordained deacon by Peter some time before 311, and presbyter by Achillas about 312. After his ordination as presbyter he was given sole charge of a church in Baukalis, where, owing to his eloquence and asceticism, and also to a certain strong personal fascination, he became very popular. On the death of Achillas he seems to have been a very nearly successful rival of Alexander for the vacant episcopate, or rather archiepiscopate, for the bishop of Alexandria was the primate of Egypt. About 318 he began to disseminate his peculiar theological opinions in Alexandrian society. He taught that Christ was not co-eternal, and therefore not co-equal, with the Father; that he was pre-existent, however, having been created by the Father out of nothing before all other creatures; that He was the Creator of the world and became incarnate for the salvation of men through the Virgin Mary; that, being a creature, He had the power of

choosing good or evil and might conceivably change from good to evil; that in a secondary sense He might be called God, and Logos, but He did not share in the substance of the Father, and therefore there was a time when He was not. Alexander, hearing these sentiments bruited about the city, sought to check their further dissemination by remonstrating with Arius, but without success. Arius continued the propagation of his opinions and with even increased boldness. Then Alexander summoned a conference of the clergy, in which there was a free discussion between the adherents of Arius and the orthodox clergy. At first Alexander sought to conciliate, but finally he took strong ground and unequivocally asserted the co-eternity of the Son with the Father, and administered a reproof to Arius. The latter retorted by charging Alexander with Sabellianism. The conference broke up without reaching any conclusion. Arius and his adherents continued the agitation. Then Alexander wrote a letter to Arius and his supporters, exhorting them to renounce their "impiety," and this letter was signed by a majority of the clergy. This also proved to be fruitless, and a synod was called of nearly one hundred Egyptian and Libyan bishops before which the Arians were summoned to appear. In the trial the Arians maintained their opinions, stating that the Son was not eternal, but was created by the impersonal Wisdom of the

Father. When asked, "Can He, then, change from good to evil, as Satan did?" they replied, "Since He is a creature, such a change is not impossible." On hearing this the synod anathematized their doctrines and excommunicated Arius. This took place about the year 320.

Instead of arresting the agitation in the city, this action seemed only to increase it. The common people mingled in the debate. Arius wrote a book of songs called "Thalia," in which in rude metre his doctrines were set forth, and these songs were sung in the streets. Says Stanley: "Sailors, millers and travellers sang the disputed doctrines at their occupations, or on their journeys. Every corner, every alley of the city was full of these discussions, — the streets, the market-places, the drapers, the money-changers, the victualers. Ask a man how many oboli, he answers by dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread, and you are told, 'The Son is subordinate to the Father.' Ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, 'The Son arose out of nothing.'" Some of the Arians in debate rudely asked women who contended with them: "Pray, had you a son before you were a mother?"

It is difficult for one trained in Occidental habits of thought to understand a condition of the popular mind like that which prevailed in the Greek-Egyptian city of Alexandria. The con-

troversy spread to other cities. Arius, finding that he could not maintain himself, left the city and went to Palestine. Here he aroused the sympathy of Eusebius of Cæsarea, who sought to mediate between him and Alexander; he also came into communication with Eusebius of Nicomedia, his former school-fellow under Lucian in Antioch, who warmly espoused his cause.

Alexander wrote a long letter to his namesake, the bishop of Constantinople, in which he gave an account of the controversy, expounded and defended at length the view of Christ which he had maintained as the true view, and announced the excommunication of Arius and his companions. He wrote similar letters to Philogonius, bishop of Antioch, to Eustathius, then bishop of Berea, and to others who held the orthodox opinion. Arius also wrote letters, defending himself, which he addressed "to all those who he thought were of his sentiments." In his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia he accused Alexander of oppressing and most severely persecuting himself and his companions, and causing them much suffering. He says: "He has driven us out of the city as atheists, because we do not concur in what he publicly preaches, namely, that the Father has always been, and that the Son has always been; that as the Father so is the Son; that the Son is unbegotten as the Father; that He is always being begotten, without hav-

ing been begotten; that neither by thought nor by any interval does God precede the Son, God and the Son having always been; and that the Son proceeds from God." He cites Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theodotius, Paulinus, and others as implicitly involved in the condemnation which had been pronounced upon himself. In explication of his own theological position he declares: "We say and believe, and have taught, and do teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor in any way unbegotten, even in part; and that he does not derive his subsistence from any matter; but that by his own will and counsel he has subsisted before time, and before ages, as perfect God, only begotten and unchangeable, and that he existed not before he was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established. For he was not unbegotten. We are persecuted, because we say that the Son had a beginning, but that God was without beginning." Arius has been charged with a want of entire frankness in this letter, and he certainly seems diplomatically to have modified the earlier statement of his views.

Eusebius of Nicomedia wrote to Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, expressing sentiments in substantial agreement with those set forth in the preceding letter of Arius, and urged him to exert his influence upon Alexander. He says: "I feel confident that if you will write to him, you will succeed in bringing him over to your

opinion." Eusebius of Cæsarea also wrote to Alexander, urging him to re-admit Arius to communion. Meanwhile a synod, convened in Bithynia, issued letters "to all the bishops, desiring them to hold communion with the Arians as with those making a true confession, and to require Alexander to hold communion with them likewise." Alexander, however, remained firm; Arius, notwithstanding the archbishop's uncompromising attitude, returned to Alexandria and resumed his functions.

Eusebius now brought the matter before Constantine and persuaded him to write a letter to Alexander and Arius to allay the strife and reconcile the antagonists. The bearer of the letter was Hosius, bishop of Cordova in Spain, and the friend and trusted counsellor of Constantine. In this letter the emperor expresses his great desire for peace, and his grief over the dissensions that had arisen in Alexandria. He exclaims: "O glorious Providence of God! How deep a wound did not my ears only, but my very heart, receive in the report that divisions existed among yourselves more grievous still than those which continued in that country!" (He alludes to the Donatist schism in Africa.) "So that you, through whose aid I had hoped to procure a remedy for the errors of others, are in a state which needs healing even more than theirs." After setting forth his understanding of how the

quarrel arose, he says: "Let therefore both the unguarded question and the inconsiderate answer receive your mutual forgiveness. For the cause of your difference has not been any of the leading doctrines or precepts of the Divine law, nor has any new heresy respecting the worship of God arisen among you. You are in truth of one and the same judgment: you may therefore well join in communion and fellowship. For as long as you continue to contend about these small and very insignificant questions, it is not fitting that so large a portion of God's people should be under the direction of your judgment, since you are thus divided between yourselves." He appeals to them thus: "Restore me then my quiet days, and untroubled nights, that the joy of undimmed light, the delight of a tranquil life, may henceforth be my portion. Else must I needs mourn, with constant tears, nor shall I be able to pass the residue of my days in peace. For while the people of God, whose fellow-servant I am, are thus divided among themselves by an unreasonable and pernicious spirit of contention, how is it possible that I shall be able to maintain tranquillity of mind?" It is evident from his letter that Constantine little understood the nature and importance of the matter under discussion, and the extent to which the controversy had gone, yet it is uncritical to say, with Pusey, that he attached as much importance to

the Easter controversy as he did to the controversy on the relation of the Son to the Father, if not more.

Hosius delivered the letter, but found that the contention had grown too fierce and had spread too widely to be quieted even by imperial influence. It appears that during, or immediately after, the mission of Hosius, Arius wrote a letter of remonstrance which angered the emperor. To this Constantine, who was now in a different mood, or perhaps had come under different influences, replied in a letter to Arius filled with irony and invective against him and his adherents. This he caused to be published throughout the cities. He also wrote to the Nicomedians severely censuring Eusebius and Theognis, the bishop of Nicæa. The controversy had now attained such proportions that Constantine, probably at the suggestion of Hosius, summoned an Ecumenical Council of the bishops of the Church to meet in the city of Nicæa in the spring of 325.

The impression which one gets from the clever and brilliant pages of Gibbon is not at all favorable to the Christians. Gibbon, learned as he was, seems to have had no power to appreciate the deeper aspects of the great controversy that distracted the Christian Church. There is much, indeed, in the conduct and spirit of the various disputants to excite mirth, which at times, if not

restrained by charity, even deepens into scorn. But those men, who debated over abstract theological questions with a vehemence and fury which we can little understand, were not mere fanatics and selfish ecclesiastical disputants. In their way they were grappling with the profoundest problem of philosophy as well as theology, and were fighting a battle the result of which has been of the deepest significance to the entire Christian Church throughout all succeeding centuries. Whatever may be our individual views as to the doctrine of the Trinity, we cannot, if we are serious students of the progress of human thought, treat lightly the discussions which finally precipitated the formula known as the Nicene Creed.

Nicæa, where the Council was convened, was a city in Bithynia about twenty miles from Nicomedia, which was the ancient capital of Bithynia, and, since the time of Diocletian, the capital city of the empire in the East. It was situated near the Propontis, at the head of the Ascanian lake. Strabo, who wrote about the beginning of the Christian era, thus describes Nicæa as it appeared in his time: "It is surrounded by a very large and very fertile plain, which in the summer is not very healthy. Its first founder was Antigonus, the son of Philip, who called it Antigonia. It was then rebuilt by Lysimachus, who changed its name to that of his

wife Nicæa. She was the daughter of Antipater. The city is situated in a plain. Its shape is quadrangular, eleven stadia [about one and one-third miles] in circuit. It has four gates. Its streets are divided at right angles, so that the four gates may be seen from a single stone set up in the middle of the Gymnasium." Stanley somewhat fancifully suggests that the name, as being of good omen, may have influenced the mind of Constantine — *Νίκη* meaning victory. More probably the place was chosen because of its proximity to the Eastern capital, and because also it was easy of access. The wretched Turkish village of Is-nik (*εἰς Νίκαιαν*), which is the modern representative of the ancient Nicæa, contains a few ruined mosques and the remains of a solitary Christian Church dedicated to "the Repose of the Virgin," and is surrounded by tangled thickets in which lie scattered broken columns, — mournful relics of a once beautiful and quite populous city. Stanley, who visited the place before writing his History of the Eastern Church, tells us that within the little church in Is-nik may be found a rude picture commemorating the Council, — "the one event which, amidst all the vicissitudes of Nicæa, has secured for it an immortal name."

Two interesting reflections occur to us at this point. One is the extraordinary spectacle of a Roman emperor, sole ruler of a domain that was

co-extensive with all Europe and a good part of Asia and Africa, calling an Ecumenical Council of a religious sect which had arisen less than three hundred years before from the preaching of a Galilean peasant! The other is the session of this Council in the very province where two hundred and fifteen years before had begun the formal persecution of this religious sect by the empire.

Whatever may have been the political motives which determined Constantine to call the Council, — and undoubtedly there were political motives, since the strife in the Church, extending itself among the laity, had already "threatened serious consequences of a political nature," — he was influenced also by his regard for the Church; and, considering the bishops to be representatives of God and Christ and organs of the Divine Spirit, he naturally looked to them to provide the means for restoring peace. As Neander suggests, he also "had before him the established custom of deciding controversies in the single provinces by assemblies composed of all the provincial bishops." It would appear to Constantine, therefore, to be the most natural means of settling not only the doctrinal controversy but also the controversy over the time for holding the Easter festival, to convoke a Council of all the bishops in his empire. In his summons to the bishops the emperor directed that the means for public

conveyance should be put at their disposal, and provision was made for two presbyters and three servants to accompany each bishop. Dean Stanley justly observes that the controversy which was the occasion of the Council was characteristically Eastern and Greek, — "such as no Western mind could have originated." It is not surprising, therefore, that of the more than three hundred bishops who came to the Council (the traditional number is three hundred and eighteen) three hundred and ten were from the East, and that the language used in the Council was Greek. Accompanying the bishops was a multitude of presbyters, deacons and acolytes, aggregating in all perhaps two thousand, and even a higher number is given. One account states the total number as two thousand three hundred and forty-eight. It was a motley company that came together, containing representatives from Egypt and Libya and Nubia and Spain and Italy and Gaul and Pannonia and Arabia and Syria and Cappadocia and even Persia and Scythia. Eusebius likens it to the gathering in Jerusalem in the time of the Apostles, "among whom were Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and the parts of Libya about Cyrene; and sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians." "But that assembly," he adds, "was less, in that not all who

composed it were ministers of God; but in the present company, the number of bishops exceeded two hundred and fifty, while that of the presbyters and deacons in their train, and the crowd of acolytes and other attendants was altogether beyond computation." The majority of these were undoubtedly uneducated, and many of them were obscure, but among them were men of learning and eloquence and distinction. The various motives that drew these men together were personal interest in the discussion and its issues, desire to promote the peace of the Church, curiosity to see the emperor, and, in some cases certainly, a hope of furthering private ends. As the crowds began to arrive the controversy between the partisans of the various views broke out on the streets. Laymen and philosophers as well as ecclesiastics mingled in the discussion. A story is variously told by Socrates, Sozomen, and Rufinus that a certain heathen philosopher named Eulogius, or "Fair-Speech," was so skilful in sophistical debate that he overcame his Christian opponents, when suddenly an aged Confessor, whom one or two later writers wrongly identify with the shepherd-bishop Spyridon, stepped forth in defence of the faith. He was a rude figure, bearing, in one empty eye-socket and a mutilated leg, the marks of the terrible persecution under Maximian;[1] and the bystanders

[1] This description fits Paphnutius rather than Spyridon.

were excited, some of them to laughter by his appearance, and some of them to anxiety because he seemed a champion that by his want of learning and dialectical skill invited defeat. The old man, nothing daunted, abruptly said to the sophist: "Christ and the apostles left us, not a system of logic, nor a vain deceit, but a naked truth, to be guarded by faith and good works." He then briefly recited the simple and impressive elements of the Christian creed, and said: "Do not therefore expend your labor in vain by striving to disprove facts which can only be understood by faith, or by scrutinizing the manner in which these things did or did not come to pass. Answer me, dost thou believe?" The philosopher, overcome with astonishment at the directness and dignity of the aged confessor, replied: "I believe." The old man answered: "Then, if thou believest, rise and follow me to the Lord's house, and receive the sign of this faith." The philosopher turned to his disciples, and the other bystanders, and said: "Hear, my learned friends. So long as it was a matter of words, I opposed words to words, and whatever was spoken I overthrew by my skill in speaking; but when, in the place of words, power came out of the speaker's lips, words could no longer resist power, man could no longer resist. If any of you feel as I have felt, let him believe in Christ, and let him follow this old man in whom God has

spoken." The story is not inherently incredible, and is a fine example "of the magnetic power of earnestness and simplicity over argument and speculation."

The Council opened some time in the last of May, or early in June.[1] The meetings were held mainly in a large hall in the imperial residence. According to Stanley, the first meeting was held in the Gymnasium, or the church, but the subsequent meetings were held in the palace. When the bishops, with their assistant deacons and presbyters, were all assembled and seated on benches ranged along the walls on each side of the large oblong hall, and "a low chair of wrought gold" had been set for the emperor at the upper end of the seats, "general silence prevailed in expectation of the emperor's arrival." I quote from Eusebius' "Life of Constantine" his description of Constantine's appearance before the Council: "First of all, three of his immediate family entered in succession, then others also preceded his approach, not of the soldiers or guards who usually accompanied him, but only friends in the faith. And now, all rising at the signal which indicated the emperor's entrance, at last he him-

[1] Socrates says: "This Synod was convened (as we have discovered from the notation of the date prefixed to the record of the Synod) in the consulate of Paulinus and Julian, on the 20th day of May, and in the 636th year from the reign of Alexander the Macedonian." Others, however, give dates varying from May 20 to June 19. Contemporary information is very scanty.

self proceeded through the midst of the assembly, like some heavenly messenger of God, clothed in raiment which glittered as it were with rays of light, reflecting the glowing radiance of a purple robe, and adorned with the brilliant splendor of gold and precious stones. Such was the external appearance of his person; and with regard to his mind, it was evident that he was distinguished by piety and godly fear. This was indicated by his downcast eyes, the blush on his countenance, and his gait. For the rest of his personal excellences, he surpassed all present in height of stature and beauty of form, as well as in majestic dignity of mien, and invincible strength and vigor. All these graces, united to a suavity of manner, and a serenity becoming his imperial station, declared the excellence of his mental qualities to be above all praise."

The emperor remained standing until the bishops beckoned him to be seated, and then the whole assembly also sat down, and the Council formally opened. At this point, according to Theodoret, Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, pronounced a panegyric upon the emperor, but, according to Sozomen and other writers, it would seem to have been Eusebius of Cæsarea who addressed the emperor, and this testimony is not contradicted by Eusebius himself.

Before the opening of the Council, immediately upon the emperor's arrival in the city, there had

been put into his hand a large number of petitions from various ecclesiastics, "containing complaints against those by whom they considered themselves aggrieved." Constantine, in his reply to the address of welcome by Eusebius, disclaimed having read the petitions, and said: "All these accusations will be brought forward at the great day of judgment, and will be judged by the Great Judge of all men; as to me, I am but a man, and it would be evil in me to take cognizance of such matters, seeing that the accusers and the accused are priests; and priests ought so to act as never to become amenable to the judgment of others. Imitate, therefore, the Divine love and mercy of God, and be ye reconciled to one another; withdraw your accusations against each other, be ye of one mind, and devote your attention to those subjects connected with the faith on account of which we are assembled." He then ordered a brazier to be brought in and burnt the petitions in the presence of the assembly.

The emperor's address to the Council, delivered in a "calm and gentle tone," was simple, dignified, and entirely conciliatory. He earnestly exhorted the bishops to peace. "Delay not, then, dear friends; delay not, ye ministers of God, and faithful servants of him who is our common Lord and Saviour: begin from this moment to discard the causes of that disunion which has existed among you, and remove the perplexities of con-

troversy by embracing the principles of peace. For by such conduct you will at the same time be acting in a manner most pleasing to the Supreme God, and you will confer an exceeding favor on me who am your fellow-servant."

The address was delivered in Latin and was immediately repeated in Greek by the imperial translator.

It will help us to get a more vivid idea of this memorable Council if I give some brief notice of the more distinguished personalities who filled places in it. Among these, of course, the emperor comes first. Constantine was born at Naissus, Upper Mœsia, in 274; he was therefore, at the time of the Council, forty-nine years old and in his full prime. His father, Constantius, who was a nephew of the emperor Claudius, was made Cæsar under Diocletian's complex imperial system in 292, and ruled over Spain, Gaul, and Britain. On the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, in 305, he became Augustus, with Galerius.

Constantine's mother was Helena, the daughter of an inn-keeper. Since the time of William of Malmesbury the idea has been widely current that she was a British princess, and that Constantine, her first and only son, was born in Britain; but the truth is that she was a native of Bithynia and she held no higher position than that of concubine to Constantius until after the birth of her

son, when she was formally married. When Constantius became Cæsar he divorced Helena because Maximian wished him to marry Theodora, the emperor's step-daughter. After Constantine became emperor, Helena, who had never remarried, was recalled to the court, and under his influence she became a Christian. She is famous in ecclesiastical history because of a pilgrimage which she made to the Holy Land when she was eighty years old, and on which she is said to have discovered the true cross of Christ.

Constantine, at the age of sixteen, was sent to the court of Diocletian, where he was kept as a sort of hostage for his father. He was a youth of great enterprise and courage, and early developed exceptional military skill. In 296 he served with such distinction in the Egyptian campaign, and, later, in the war with Persia, under Galerius, that he was appointed a tribune of the first rank. Galerius became so jealous of the rising young soldier that he sent him on enterprises of unusual danger, but the discipline which Constantine thus received proved a good schooling for his future career.

In 305, when Constantius became Augustus, he requested that his son might be sent to him. Permission was given, but, having reason to fear that it would be revoked, Constantine left the court at once, and made a journey of extraordinary rapidity across Europe. In the following year Constantius died at York, Britain, and with

the sympathy and support of the army Constantine assumed the purple. His course from that time on was marked by a series of triumphs over his rivals until, in October, 312, he defeated Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge and entered Rome. He was now sole emperor of the West. In July 323 he defeated Licinius at Adrianople, and thus became sole ruler of the empire East and West. Constantius his father had adopted a tolerant policy toward the Christians, and ignored the persecuting edict issued by Galerius. Constantine followed his father's policy. Previous to the battle at the Milvian Bridge he became a professed convert to Christianity, being incited thereto, according to Eusebius, by the appearance, a little after mid-day, of a blazing Cross in the heavens bearing the motto, "By this conquer," and by a dream on the following night, in which Christ interpreted to him the sign, and directed him to make a standard on which the cross, or, according to others, a monogram consisting of the first two letters of *Χριστός*, should be wrought. Constantine's conversion, at this time, was not at all spiritual, but his favorable attitude towards Christianity is apparent in the edict which, conjointly with Licinius, he issued in March, 313, known as the "Edict of Milan." This edict restored all civil and religious rights to the Christians and secured to them full toleration throughout the empire.

Constantine's military career closed with his victory over Licinius, and the remainder of his reign was tranquil, save as it was disturbed by ecclesiastical strife. At the Council he was in the full splendor of his fame as conqueror of all his enemies and rivals, and as the first Christian emperor. He was tall and powerfully built, with a thick neck and broad shoulders, the embodiment of strength and sturdy health. His complexion was ruddy, his nose slightly hooked, his eyes brilliant and indicative of commanding force, and his whole bearing lion-like. His hair and beard were slightly curly and rather thin, and his voice, usually, was gentle and musical. Clad in splendid attire and surrounded by the glamour of his achievements and position, he made a profound impression upon the Council; and yet, so independent in thought were these Christian bishops, and so fearless were they through their training and their convictions, that their final decision seems to have been in no way materially affected by the imperial presence, since it was given in favor of the Alexandrian position, notwithstanding that Constantine, in so far as he understood the question at issue, was really a sympathizer with the Arians.

Among all those who were present at the Council no one has projected so large a figure upon the vision of subsequent times as the little

and youthful deacon from Alexandria, Athanasius, who was not strictly a member of the Council, but only an attendant upon the good bishop Alexander. He was born in Alexandria about 296, and was therefore only twenty-nine years old at the time of the Council. Little is known of his family, save that an aunt of his suffered from Arian cruelty during his second exile. He seems to have been poor in material goods, but in the intellectual atmosphere of the Egyptian Athens he acquired a substantial education. Of his boyhood Rufinus tells us the following story: One day Alexander, the bishop, looking from his window towards the sea, saw some boys playing on the beach, in imitation of the church ceremonial. After a little time, fearing that the game was drawing too near to sacrilege, Alexander called the boys into his presence, and then found that one of them, named Athanasius, had played the part of a bishop and, as such, had baptized several of his companions, who had never previously received the rite. After consulting with his clergy, the bishop determined to recognize this baptism as valid, and he commended the boy-bishop and his companions to their respective relations to be trained for the service of the Church. There is a serious chronological objection to this story, since at the time when Alexander became bishop Athanasius must have been quite seventeen years old, and, therefore, a

rather large boy to be playing at church. However, this is true, that his unusual ability was early recognized, and he became an inmate of Alexander's house as his companion and secretary. It was both a fortunate and an agreeable position for the youth, since it afforded him exceptional opportunities for education, and Alexander was a man of sweet and lovable temper. Athanasius gave himself assiduously to the study of Christian theology. As early as 318, about the beginning of the controversy between Arius and Alexander, he produced two works, or essays, one entitled, "Against the Greeks," and the other entitled, "On the Incarnation." Of the latter writing Moehler says, that it is "the first attempt that had been made to present Christianity and the chief circumstances of the life of Jesus Christ under a scientific aspect. By the sure tact of his noble and Christian nature, everything is referred to the Person of the Redeemer: everything rests upon Him; He appears throughout." In the former writing he departed from the method of previous apologists; for, disregarding the absurd and immoral stories of the gods which they had repeatedly exposed and ridiculed, he attacked the very basis of pagan theology. His conception of nature was determined by his fundamental principle of the Divine Immanence, and in this principle he found the perfectly effective argument against polytheism. "The all-powerful and

perfect reason of the Father," he said, "penetrating the universe, developing everywhere its forces, illuminating with His light things visible and invisible, made of them all one whole and bound them together, allowing nothing to escape from His powerful action, vivifying and preserving all beings in themselves, and in the harmony of the creation."

Athanasius was ordained deacon about this time and placed at the head of the Alexandrian deacons. He threw himself into the Arian controversy with all the ardor of a fervid temperament and a profound conviction of the truth of the orthodox conception. Until the time of the Council, however, he kept his own personality in the back-ground, and did his work chiefly as an assistant of Alexander.

In the Council, where he quickly became the leading figure, and a tower of strength to Alexander and his companions, he showed himself a keen disputant, a close reasoner, and a ready and fluent interpreter of Scripture. "He so well defended the doctrines of the apostles," says Theodoret, "that he obtained the approbation of all who upheld the truth, and excited the enmity of those who opposed it."

Within a year after the Council, Alexander died, and Athanasius was chosen as his successor. His personal appearance was not calculated at first sight to make any great impression

upon beholders. He was short of stature, almost dwarfish, and had a slight stoop. He had a hooked nose and a short beard which spread out at the sides. But there must have been something more than ordinary in his countenance, especially when it was illuminated by the excitement of debate. Gregory Nazianzen tells us, that he had "almost angelic beauty of face and expression."

Of Arius I have already given some account; it remains only for me to sketch his personal appearance. At the time of the Council he was about sixty years old, more than double the age of his chief antagonist. He was tall and lean, with a certain sinuous motion of his body, — like that of a snake, his antagonists said. He had an emaciated and pallid countenance and a downcast look. His abundant hair was long and tangled. He had, however, a singularly sweet voice and an earnest and winning manner, and he displayed at times a kind of wild and passionate eloquence. He was a man of severely ascetic temper and habits, and exercised an unusual degree of personal fascination over his followers.

The aged Alexander, bishop of the most intellectual diocese in Christendom at that time, was one of the foremost in dignity if not in intellectual force. Of all the bishops present in the

Council he was the only one who bore the title of *Papa*, or Pope. That term had been used to designate the Christian bishop in Carthage as well as in Alexandria, but, as far as we can learn, in no other part of Christendom. Alexander's influence on the discussions was completely overshadowed by that of his able deacon Athanasius. On account of his dignity and position Alexander was chosen one of the presidents of the Council, in company with Eustathius, the pious, learned, and eloquent bishop of Antioch, and probably also Eusebius of Cæsarea.

High in the esteem of the Council was the already venerable Hosius, bishop of Corduba, or Cordova, in Spain. For nearly half a century he was the foremost bishop of his time. He was born in Spain about the year 256, and was therefore nearly or quite seventy years old at the time of the Council. He lived to be over a hundred, and sustained an important relation to the controversies that disturbed the church subsequent to the Council. Hosius was much revered and trusted by Constantine, who sought his advice in ecclesiastical matters. His spirit was uniformly mild and conciliatory.

Another important figure was that of Eusebius of Cæsarea, who had been a pupil and friend of Pamphilus, whose name he took, so that he is known in history as Eusebius Pamphili. Pamphilus, who

was at once student and saint, lover of learning and lover of God, had sealed his life-long confession of his Master with his blood in 309. Eusebius was the most learned man and the most accomplished and famous writer of his time. To him we are indebted for the earliest and most important history of the first three centuries. He has been justly called "the father of Ecclesiastical History." He was the confidant of the emperor, and, in the Council, occupied the first seat to the right of Constantine.

Eusebius of Nicomedia, the most distinguished representative of the Arian movement, the leader rather than the follower of Arius, was a man of considerable learning and undoubted energy. According to Ammianus Marcellinus he was a distant relative of the emperor Julian and therefore, possibly, a relative of Constantine. He seems to have been a friend and supporter of Licinius, and, after the latter's fall, to have maintained sympathetic relations with his widow, Constantia, the sister of Constantine. Undoubtedly she protected him from the natural consequences of his devotion to her brother's previous rival. He became a bitter and persistent foe of Athanasius.

Among the more picturesque figures were James, bishop of Nisibis in Mesopotamia, con-

spicuous for the scars which he had received in the persecution by Maximian, and famed for many miracles; Nicholas, bishop of Myra, famed for his piety and asceticism; the latter he is said to have practised even when he was an infant, abstaining from his mother's breast on Wednesdays and Fridays, the canonical fast days; and Paphnutius, a bishop of Upper Thebes, eminent for piety and good sense, who had one eye torn out and one leg mutilated in the persecution by Maximian, and therefore was much honored as a Confessor. Constantine is said to have felt such regard for this man that he kissed the place where his eye had been torn out, and pressed his purple robe against the Confessor's mutilated leg. To Paphnutius were ascribed many miracles.

Spyridon, a bishop of Cyprus, had been a shepherd; but, as Socrates tells us, "so great was his sanctity while a shepherd that he was thought worthy of being made a shepherd of men." He was therefore made bishop of one of the cities in Cyprus named Trimithuntis. Spyridon, however, did not cease to feed his sheep. Among the extraordinary things related of him are the following: Some thieves, one midnight, planned to carry off his sheep; but these were protected by Divine Power, and the thieves suddenly found themselves held fast by invisible bands in the fold. In the morning they were discovered by

the good bishop with their hands tied behind their backs. He prayed with them, and then set them free, "exhorting them to support themselves by honest labor, and not to take anything unjustly." He was evidently a man of some humor, for when he sent the thieves away, he gave them a ram, in order, as he said, that they might not "appear to have watched all night in vain." Another story tells us that his virgin daughter Irene, who shared in her father's piety, had been intrusted with an ornament of considerable value. This, for security, she had hidden in the ground. Some time afterwards she died without making known the hiding-place of the treasure. When the owner of the ornament finally came to claim his property, not finding Irene, he alternately charged her father with an attempt at fraud, and besought him with tears to restore the deposit. The remainder of the story I tell in the words of Socrates: "The old man, regarding this person's loss as his own misfortune, went to the tomb of his daughter, and called upon God to show him in anticipation the promised resurrection. Nor was he disappointed in his hope; for the virgin again reviving appeared to her father, and having pointed out to him the spot where she had hidden the ornament, she once more departed."

Among the delegates was Acesius, bishop of a Novatian sect. The presence of this schismat-

ical ecclesiastic by invitation of the emperor is illustrative of Constantine's desire for ecclesiastical harmony. Acesius was one of those who held that a person who had committed mortal sin after baptism could not be again received to the Communion; he should be exhorted to repentance, but must not expect remission from the priests, though he might be forgiven by God, who alone had power to forgive sins. Declaring his views to the emperor, near the close of the Council, it is said that he was facetiously advised by Constantine to "place a ladder and climb alone into heaven."

There was also Theophilus, the Goth, who was the predecessor and teacher of Ulfilas, the famous Arian missionary to the Goths and the translator of the sacred Scriptures into the Gothic tongue.

Carthage was represented by its bishop, Cæcilian, who had long been in the midst of a violent contention in Carthage, where he had stood as the leader of the moderate party, and resisted the craze of the zealots for martyrdom and their implacableness towards the "lapsed."

The bishop of Rome, Sylvester, was not present, his great age preventing him from making the long journey to Nicæa. He was repre-

sented, however, by the two presbyters, Victor and Vicentius, who, in accordance with the imperial provision for the bishops, probably would have accompanied him had he been able to attend the Council. These men seem to have had no special prominence or influence in the Council. Rome's day had not yet come.

The debate in the Council opened with a violent controversy, each party vehemently charging error upon the other and as vehemently refuting countercharges. The Arian party was led by the three Bithynian bishops, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicæa, and Maris of Chalcedon. The party of Alexander was led, not by the bishop himself, but by his deacon, Athanasius. Besides these two parties there was a third, consisting, at the beginning of the Council, of the majority of the bishops, led by Eusebius of Cæsarea. These, who were theological disciples of Origen, occupied a middle ground and shaded off, by degrees, on the one hand toward the views of Athanasius, and, on the other, toward the views of Arius. Stanley, with characteristic optimism, declares that the discussion was based, not on the principle of authority, save as that appeared in the appeal to the sacred Scriptures, but on the principle of free inquiry; and the right of free expression of opinion was recognized. But this judgment must be taken with a considerable

grain of salt. In the course of the discussion, a creed was produced which had been signed by the eighteen Arian bishops. This creed is not reported, but it evidently set forth extreme Arian views, for it was received, not in accordance with "the principle of free inquiry," and a recognition of "the right of free expression of opinion," but with "tumultuous disapprobation," and was torn in pieces on the spot. So vehement was the opposition to it that all the signers but two, Theonas and Secundus, at once gave up Arius and he was expelled from the Council. Eusebius of Cæsarea then presented a creed which had been in use, certainly since his childhood, in the see of Cæsarea. It is as follows:—

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the First-born of every creature, begotten of the Father before all worlds, by whom also all things were made. Who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived amongst men, and suffered, and rose again on the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in one Holy Ghost. Believing each of them to be and to have existed, the Father, only the Father, and the Son, only the Son, and the Holy Ghost, only the Holy Ghost: As also our Lord sending forth His own disciples to preach, said: 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the

Son, and of the Holy Ghost;' concerning which things we affirm that this is so, and that we so think, and that it has long so been held, and that we remain steadfast to death for this faith, anathematizing every godless heresy. That we have thought these things from our heart and soul, from the time that we have known ourselves, and that we now think and say thus in truth, we testify in the name of Almighty God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, being able to prove even by demonstration, and to persuade you that in past times also thus we believed and preached."

This Creed the Arian minority were willing to adopt, and it was approved by the emperor; but the Alexandrian party were suspicious of a statement of doctrine that Arians could accept, and they held off. Then a letter from Eusebius of Nicomedia was produced, in which the writer declared that the application to Christ of the term Homoousion (ὁμοούσιον, "of the same substance"), was absurd. This letter, like the Arian creed, was torn in pieces amidst great excitement, and the fatal word, that was to be the watchword in so many bitter conflicts, was adopted by the Alexandrian wing and promptly applied to all others as a shibboleth.

"Homoousion" was not a new word. It had been used by Irenæus in his criticism of the Gnostic theories of Valentinus, and, later, it was used as a test of orthodoxy in the trial of Paul of Samosata. It was denounced by the Arians as

savoring of Sabellianism, and defended by the orthodox as combating polytheism. In the midst of the struggle, however, the word was adopted by the emperor, as a conciliatory measure, probably under the influence of Hosius, and finally was acceded to with certain qualifications, perhaps also with certain mental reservations, by the party of Eusebius of Cæsarea. The creed was then agreed upon and, in the course of a little time, was signed by nearly or quite all of the bishops. Constantine, though he had leaned decidedly toward the semi-Arianism of Eusebius, approved the decision of the bishops. Eusebius took a day for consideration. He found that Constantine understood the word "Homoousion" in a sense accordant with his own previous views, and in the same sense he also accepted it.

This creed has passed through such modifications in later times that I give the form in which it was adopted by the Council of Nicæa: —

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible;

"And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten, that is to say, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things upon earth, — who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, and was made man, suffered, and rose again on the

third day, and went up into the heavens, and will come again to judge the living and the dead;

"And in the Holy Ghost.

"But those that say, 'there was when He was not,' and 'before He was begotten He was not,' and that 'He came into existence from not-being,' or who profess that the Son of God is of different substance (ὑποστάσεως) or essence (οὐσίας), or that He is created, or changeable, or variable, are anathematized by the Catholic Church."

Eusebius of Nicomedia and the bishops of Nicæa and Chalcedon, Theognis and Maris, still hesitated. The former consulted Constantia, the emperor's sister, and she persuaded him to comply in the interests of peace. They all then subscribed, slyly inserting, it is said, an Iota (ι) into the word "Homoousion" ("of the same substance"), making it read "Homoiousion" (ὁμοιούσιον, "of like substance"), but they refused to approve the anathemas pronounced against Arius. Eusebius and Theognis were deposed and ordered into exile, but Constantia interceded for them, and they submitted, and were received and subscribed the creed. The bishops Theonas and Secundus, the deacon Euzoius, the reader Achillas, and the presbyter Saras, were banished, but, according to statements made by Philostorgius, Socrates, and Jerome, they also were ultimately recalled and allowed to subscribe. Arius disappeared, but it seems that he too came back, and the only penalty inflicted on him was a prohibition

against his returning to Alexandria. His book, "Thalia," was condemned and burnt.

Of the debate on the Easter question we have no record. The letter of the Council which communicated its decisions to the Churches contains the following statement as to the conclusion reached: —

"We have also gratifying intelligence to communicate to you relative to unity of judgment on the subject of the most holy feast of Easter; for this point has been happily settled through your prayers; so that all the brethren in the East who have heretofore kept this festival when the Jews did, will henceforth conform to the Romans and to us, and to all who from the earliest time have observed our period of celebrating Easter."

Although in some quarters and among a few minor sects the custom still continued of celebrating the Easter festival on the fourteenth Nisan, the controversy on this subject practically ended with the Council of Nicæa.

A more important matter for the Council to settle was that of the Meletian schism. Of this schism I have already given some account.[1] By the decree of the Council, Meletius was allowed to retain his episcopal dignity, but he was deprived of all authority either to ordain or to nominate for ordination, and those who had been appointed by him to ecclesiastical office were

[1] See page 396.

required to be reordained before admission to the Communion and to rank as ministers. Even then they were to be accounted as inferior to those who had been ordained previously by Alexander. Meletius retired to his see of Lycopolis and was silent until after the death of Alexander; but he took part in the controversies which arose about Athanasius, and, before his death, contrary to the decree of the Council, he nominated a friend as his successor in the episcopate. His followers were gradually absorbed into the Arian party.

The Council promulgated twenty canons on discipline. The *first* fixed the incapacity of eunuchs either to receive ordination or to retain ecclesiastical office if previously ordained. The *second* prohibited the choice of any one as presbyter or bishop who had not long been baptized or had not received full instruction. The *third* guarded the purity of the clergy. The *fourth* required that the consecration of a bishop should be, if possible, by all the bishops of the province, but it allowed his consecration by three bishops, provided that the consent of the absent bishops had been obtained in writing, and that the consecration should be finally confirmed by the metropolitan. The *fifth* interdicted any one who had been excommunicated by his own bishop from being received to the communion by other bishops, and provided for semi-annual synods in each province to be held in the spring and autumn.

The *sixth* defined the relations between bishops and their metropolitans, and the question of episcopal jurisdiction. The *seventh* conceded to the bishop of Ælia Capitolina, the new city that had been built on the site of Jerusalem, the second place of honor. The *eighth* provided for the return of those who had been clerical members of the sect known as the Cathari to the bosom of the Church. The *ninth* and *tenth* declared null and void the ordination of presbyters made without proper inquiry; of those who had confessed sins committed before ordination; and of those who had been ordained in ignorance, or whose sins had come to light after ordination. The *eleventh* and *twelfth* dealt with the "lapsed," prescribing the conditions for their readmission to the Communion. The *thirteenth* forbade the denial of the Communion to any one who was likely to die. The *fourteenth* directed that catechumens who had relapsed must remain three years among the "hearers." The *fifteenth* and *sixteenth* forbade the translation of bishops from one see to another, and the removal of presbyters or deacons from their own church to another. The *seventeenth* commanded the deposition of clergy who lent money on usury. The *eighteenth* prohibited deacons from exercising any function that belongs to a presbyter. The *nineteenth* required followers of Paul of Samosata to be rebaptized and, in the case of clergy, also to be

reordained. The *twentieth* ordered all persons to pray standing on Sundays and during the time between Easter and Pentecost.

It was proposed to pass another canon establishing the celibacy of the clergy, but this was defeated, mainly by the influence of Paphnutius, who was himself a celibate. He earnestly entreated the bishops "not to impose so heavy a yoke on the ministers of religion," defended marriage as "honorable among all," and warned them of the danger to morality, and the injury to the Church that would surely result from too great stringency. Having once more vindicated the chastity of the marital relation, he expressed the opinion that those who "had previously entered on their sacred calling should abjure matrimony, according to the ancient tradition of the Church; but that no one should be separated from her to whom, while yet unordained, he had been legally united." The whole assembly listened to his reasoning, and all debate on this point ceased. "His speech," says Stanley, "produced a profound sensation. His own austere life of unblemished celibacy gave force to every word that he uttered; he showed that rare excellence of appreciating difficulties which he himself did not feel, and of honoring a state of life which was not his own."

The Council closed on the 25th of August. During its session two of the bishops, Chrysanthus and Mysonius, had died and were buried in

the cemetery of Nicæa. A legend of later times tells us that, when the day for final subscription to the decrees of the Council came, the bishops took the roll to the grave of the two dead men, and, addressing them, as Mohammedans are said to address their dead saints, solemnly conjured them that if now in the clearness of the heavenly vision they still approved, they would come and sign the decrees with their brethren. The bishops, leaving a blank space on the roll for the signatures, sealed and laid it on the tomb. After spending the night in prayer, in the morning they returned, and, breaking the seal, found the blank space filled with the following: "We, Chrysanthus and Mysonius, fully concurring with the first Holy and Œcumenical Synod, although removed from earth, have signed the volume with our own hands."

At the conclusion of the Council, or late during its session (Stanley gives the date as July 25), Constantine celebrated his Vicennalia, the completion of the twentieth year of his reign. He gave a brilliant and sumptuous banquet to all the bishops, showing them much honor and bestowing on them gifts — "to each individual according to his rank." He also made them a farewell address, in which, according to Eusebius, —

"He recommended them to be diligent in the maintenance of peace, to avoid contentious disputations amongst themselves, and not to be jealous if any one of their num-

ber should appear pre-eminent for wisdom and eloquence, but to esteem the excellence of one a blessing common to all. On the other hand, he reminded them that the more gifted should forbear to exalt themselves to the prejudice of their humbler brethren, since it is God's prerogative to judge of real superiority. Rather should they considerately condescend to the weaker, remembering that absolute perfection in any case is a rare quality indeed. Each, then, should be willing to accord indulgence to the other for slight offences, to regard charitably and pass over mere human weakness; holding mutual harmony in the highest honor, that no occasion of mocking might be given by their dissensions to those who are ever ready to blaspheme the word of God."

He said much more in a similar vein, and then gave the bishops permission to return to their respective countries. "This they did with joy," says Eusebius, "and," he adds, with almost grotesque disregard, or ignorance, of the truth, "thenceforward that unity of judgment at which they had arrived in the emperor's presence continued to prevail, and those who had long been divided were bound together as members of the same body." The bishops were provided with means for their homeward journey at the public expense, and Constantine sent largesses of money to be distributed among the people in various parts of the empire. He also wrote a letter to the churches, announcing the decisions of the Council, especially with reference to the Easter

question, and exhorting all to obey them. A copy of this letter was sent to every province.

The Great Council which had been called to end the controversy begun in Alexandria was in fact but the beginning of a fierce struggle that continued with wavering fortunes for Athanasian and Arian until near the end of the century, when it was, in a manner, settled in favor of the orthodox party by the action of the emperor, Theodosius. During fifty years party was arrayed against party and bishop against bishop. Now one triumphed, and now the other; and in all parties there developed great heat and bitterness of spirit, and a violence of contention that sometimes passed beyond the bounds of the most acrimonious debate, and issued in blows and bloodshed. A new class of martyrs arose — the martyrs to theological hate — and often those that suffered were quite as wrong in spirit as those who inflicted the suffering. Of Athanasius it should be said that he was conspicuous not only for his abilities, but also for the sanity and, considering all the circumstances, the fairness of his temper. His life was a succession of conflicts and enforced exiles from his see in Alexandria, but finally the principle for which he contended prevailed.

The real point at issue — the truth towards which the Christian Church was almost unconsciously moving — was not the mere Triplicity

of the Divine Nature, but the reality of the Incarnation, — God in man, and in His world. No one seems clearly to have seen this save Athanasius, and even he saw it only in part, for he did not grasp the full breadth of the idea; but he saw it with sufficient clearness to appreciate its vital importance and to stand in defence of it, if necessary, against the whole world. He felt that the fight was a struggle for the supremacy of the one truth which underlay the whole Christian philosophy and scheme of redemption, — the truth that was at once the only efficacious and the final answer to Paganism and Gnosticism, and the only ground of any reasonable hope for the salvation of the world. Salvation could be accomplished only by the actual contact and communication of God with man, therefore Athanasius and the bishops who contended in company with him held fast to the "Homoousion," — the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. Herein lies the great and lasting significance of the Nicene Council.

"The superficial mind," says Hedge, "is apt to regard these questions, which then agitated the Church and the world, as empty abstractions, senseless quibbles. But the union of God with man is no quibble; it is a truth of profound significance; and the Council of Nicæa which declared it is one of the most important assemblies that were ever convened on this earth: it dates a new era in the history of human thought. God in actual contact with

man — God in man and man in God — is the underlying idea of the Athanasian dogma which asserts that the Son is consubstantial with the Father. Probably Athanasius did not perceive the real drift and scope of his doctrine. It was only of the person of Christ that he affirmed substantial community with God. Christ united in His person two natures, the human and the divine; and, by this union of God with man in the person of Christ, human nature is redeemed and restored to health and God. This was the substance of his theology."

The decision of the Nicene Council, therefore, affirmed and fixed a principle back of which the Christian Church has never receded and from which it has never swerved. The Nicene symbol stands also as an historic witness to the fulness and richness of the Christian conception of God, in contrast with the weak multifariousness of polytheism and the barrenness of a bald deism. Thus the Christian conception of God recognizes and fulfils all that was true in the different schools of Greek philosophy.

Arianism continued in the Church with considerable force for three hundred years. The Goths, who were converted to Christianity by Ulfilas, were all Arians. Alaric, Genseric, and Theodoric the Great, who was the hero of the Nibelungen Lied, were Arians. The Lombards were Arians till the close of the sixth century. Arianism also had a strong hold, for a time, upon Spain and Southern France; but, by the begin-

ning of the seventh century, it was practically extinct.

Through all the fierce theological, and consequent political, controversies that disturbed the Church for nearly three centuries after the Great Council, the Nicene Creed survived. It is still the creed of the whole vast Greek Church; with some modifications, it is also the creed of the Latin Church; and, in its original form and stripped of its condemnatory clauses, it is substantially the creed of universal Christendom. Under the influence mainly of Augustine, the Latin theology soon dominated the Western Church, and gradually excluded or suppressed the richer and nobler thought of the Greek Fathers. The Latin theology to some extent obscured and, while seeming to affirm, almost denied the fundamental and structural doctrine of the Incarnation, the enunciation and persistent defence of which was the chief merit of Athanasius. That doctrine, however, survived through all strife, and now, amidst the changes and even the wreck of creeds, it still survives. In its real essence, it is not an arithmetical threeness of persons inexplicably inhering in one substance, so that we have the impossible conception — three equals one, — as it so often appears in dogmatic theology; but it is the reality of God in Christ, as the revelation and archetype of God in humanity, and the pledge of the perfect fulfilment of man's

life by his perfect union with the divine, "being filled with all the fulness of God." It is the supreme doctrine of Christianity, — the Incarnation, the immanence of God in the realm of personality as well as in the realm of nature. Reenforced by enlarged knowledge of the world and man, and by higher and purer conceptions of God, that doctrine rises afresh in the consciousness of the Church with power to recreate theology and to inspire and lead the thought of Christendom to a broader and truer and more spiritual philosophy of divine revelation and human history.

APPENDIX.

ON page 252 I have made the statement that "the works of Aristides are wholly lost." While this volume was passing through the press there came into my hand a copy of the recently found "Apology of Aristides." This interesting document is a Syriac version which was discovered on Mt. Sinai by Prof. J. Rendel Harris, and is issued as No. I. of Vol. I. of TEXTS AND STUDIES, published by the Cambridge University Press, under the general editorship of J. Armitage Robinson, B. D. No. I. comprises, besides the Syrian text of "The Apology of Aristides," and several Armenian fragments, an introduction, an English translation, and notes on the Syriac, by J. Rendel Harris, M.A., and an Appendix containing the main portion of the "Original Greek Text" of the Apology, as it is preserved in the story of "Barlaam and Josaphat," to which is prefixed a critical introduction, by J. Armitage Robinson, B. D.

Of "The Apology of Aristides" Eusebius gives a brief notice, according to which it must have been written as early, at least, as 133 A.D., and possibly as early as 124. Professor Harris makes an ingenious argument to prove that the date cannot be earlier than the early years of Antoninus Pius, i. e. soon after 138. The question of date is still open, however, with a strong probability in favor of 133 as against any later date.

At any rate, it is clear that in the recently discovered document we have the earliest extant Christian apologetic writing.

The "Apology" is simple and clear in style, and is occupied mainly with an exhibition of the absurdity of the heathen religious ideas and worship, the defectiveness and errors of the Jew's religion, and the simplicity and purity of the Christian faith, character, and life.

Perhaps its chief significance lies in the evidence which it affords that as early as the second quarter of the second century the Church had a Symbol of Faith, and that this symbol already embodied the main elements of the Apostle's Creed. Professor Harris thus restores the fragments of Aristides' Creed: —

"We believe in one God, Almighty
Maker of Heaven and Earth:
And in Jesus Christ His Son
. . . . . .
Born of the Virgin Mary:
. . . . . .
He was pierced by the Jews:
He died and was buried:
The third day He rose again:
He ascended into Heaven;
. . . . . .
He is about to come to judge
. . . . . ."

INDEX.

Acesius, bishop of a Novatian Sect, 426, 427.

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, opponent of Arius, 398–400; described, 422, 423.

Alexandria, its Christian School, 333–392; a centre of intellectual life, 334; the Jews in it, 334, 335; its Christian Catechetical School, 337–340.

Alexandrian School of literature and philosophy, 333, 334; divided into two schools, 333.

Antoninus Pius, his treatment of Christians, 187, 188.

Apollonius, of Tyana, 182.

Apologies for Christianity, 219–275; the extant fill 24 volumes, 220; two classes of them, — in reply to the Jews, 221; in reply to pagans, 221–275; two schools of their writers, 222, 223; their influence on the Roman emperors, 223; the Christian virtues the most effective, 224; the Greek and Latin contrasted, 224; the "Epistle to Diognetus" analyzed and characterized, 225–227; Justin Martyr's, 233–237; Tatian's, 239–246; Athenagoras's, 247–252; Theophilus's, 252; Minucius Felix's, 253; Lactantius's, 253.

Apostasies of early Christians, 202, 203; three classes of them, 202, 203; the object of persecutions, 205.

Apostles' Creed, its origin and character, 277.

Apostles of Christianity, character of the original ones, 47, 48.

"Apostolic Constitutions," contents and character of the work, 118–121; rejected as spurious by Eusebius and Athanasius, 119; accepted as apostolic by Whiston, 120; Bunsen on their origin, 120.

Apostolic Fathers, the, 99–162; their number, 99; "Didache, or the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," 101, 123–129.

Archbishop, the term first applied to all metropolitans, 73.

Arianism, its adherents, 441.

Aristides, 252; his Apology, 445.

Arius, his controversy with Alexander, 396; his doctrines, 398–400; excommunicated by a synod of bishops, 400; his doctrinal book of songs, 400; Dean Stanley on ibid., 400; finds friends in Palestine, 401; accuses Alexander of persecution, 401; explains his theological views, 402; personal appearance, 422.

Arnobius, 223.

Athanasius, a leading figure at the Council of Nicæa, 421; his per-

sonal appearance, 422; his qualities, 439; maintained the reality of the Incarnation, 440; why he held fast to the term "Homoousion," 440; Dr. Hedge on his theology, 441.

Athenagoras, his character, 247; his book "Concerning the Resurrection," 246; his "Embassy" analyzed, 247–252; his ideas of inspiration and the Logos, 251.

Aurelian, Roman Emperor, 209.

Aurelius, Marcus, 189–197; the severest persecutor of the early Christians, 189; his inconsistencies, 189; his "Meditations" quoted, 189, 190; influenced by popular clamor, 190; Christian apologies addressed to him, 192; noted martyrs in his reign, 194–197.

Baptism, by laymen, in the Early Church, 57; immersion its form for thirteen centuries, 57; Dean Stanley on its form in the Early Church, 57, 58; the Anglican rubric for that of infants, 58; how regarded in the Early Church, 86–89; the term used as the equivalent of regeneration and conversion, 87; Justin Martyr on it, 87; Tertullian and Cyprian on it, 88; the "Teaching of the Twelve" on it, 89; infant, not practised till Cyprian's time, 91; infant, opposed by Tertullian, 91.

Bardaisan, the Gnostic, his hymns and doctrine, 311, 312.

Barnabas, his supposed epistle analyzed, 121–123; its authorship doubtful, 122.

Basilides, the Gnostic, his life and teachings, 292–301; Bunsen on him, 301; character of his followers, 302, 303.

Basilides, Roman officer, his remarkable conversion, 198.

Birks, on the "Epistle to Diognetus," 227.

Bishop, meaning of the word, his earliest function, 67; the term interchangeable with "presbyter," 68; when his office was first defined, 68; causes of development of his office, 68, 69; Polycarp appointed to the office in Smyrna, 69; development of the office in Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, Corinth, and Rome, 69; also in Gaul and Africa, 70; first claim by one of universal dominion, 70; absorption by him of administering baptism and the communion, 71; Jerome, on the equivalence of bishops and presbyters, 71, 72.

Blandina, a slave girl, her martyrdom, 195.

Bunsen, his characterization of Basilides, 301.

Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, 427.

Caracalla, Roman Emperor, 200, 364.

Carpocrates, the Gnostic, his teachings, 290–292; licentiousness of his followers, 292.

Catacombs, their discovery, 22; prove the great number of early Christians in Rome, 23; estimates of their extent, 23.

Catechumenate, the, formed, 89.

Catechumens, defined, 90; divided into four classes, 90.

Celsus, on the multiplication of Christians, 30; his assault on Christianity, 222; Origen's reply to his book, 222, 371, 372.

Cerdo, the Gnostic, his doctrines, 289, 290.

Cerinthus, the Gnostic, his rise and religious views, 286–288.
Christian Catechetical School of Alexandria, its origin, purpose, and teachings, 337–340; attended by educated pagans, 338; its definition of faith, 338, 339; its characterization of the Gnosis, 338, 339; its defence of the study of philosophy, 339, 340; its beginning, 340.
Christian literature, the sub-apostolic characterized, 161, 162.
Christians, the early, their life and gospel of love, 48, 49; their voluntary communism, 54; their intolerance of paganism, 39, 40, 168; denounced as atheists, 168; regarded as unsocial and "haters of the human race," 168, 169; denounced by priests and teachers, 169; make enemies by their pure morality, 170; charged with licentiousness, magic, and treason, 171; Justin Martyr's defence of them, 171, 172; vindicated in the "Epistle to Diognetus," 172, 173; Tertullian's "Apology" on their character, 173; beginning of their political persecution, 173, 174; persecuted by the Romans, 174; their attitude toward the Roman state, 176, 177; Ramsay on their anti-Roman organization, 177.
Christianity, the germs of its development found in first three centuries, 13; its early and rapid spread, 16–22; prominent early converts, 19, 20; progress in Africa, Germany, and Great Britain, 20, 21; converts in Diocletian's reign, 21, 22; testimony of Tacitus, Pliny, and Christian apologists, to the number of its early converts, 23–31; conquers the Roman Empire in less than 300 years, 31; the greatest of spiritual forces, 32; co-extensive with the world's civilization, 32; condition of the world at its rise, 32–39; its diffusion aided by the moral conditions of the world, 35–38; causes of its rise and early growth, 39–51; Gibbon's statement of these causes considered, 39–43; its rapid spread not aided by claims of miraculous power, 40–42; its triumph a testimony to its divine origin, 50; primitive, was non-sacerdotal, 56; hospitable to all goodness in ideals and endeavors, 96; began without schools, or culture, 99; its spread not explainable by "natural causes," 100, 101; its early struggle with heathenism, 163–217; forms of opposition it encountered, 164, 165; causes of early popular antipathy to it, 167–170; its apologists, 218–275; Jewish and pagan arguments against it, 221, 222; its true defence, 275; summary of its early history, 393, 394.
Church, the Early Christian, its organization, 52–98; had no ritual, ordinances, or distinction of clergy and laity, 55; had no creeds or dogmatic tests, its members upon one level, 58; its officers, 60; its three orders of ministers, 60; its worship, 79; its controversy over time of Easter festival, 79, 80; simplicity of its worship, 80, 81; fragments of its hymns, 81, 82; changes in its views of worship, 84; its observance of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, 84; asceticism in it, 86; its first tendency toward sacramentalism, 86–89; its analogy to the organization of the

Roman Empire, 94; review of its changes, 94, 96; all types exist germinally in it, 97, 98; a period of obscurity in its history, 100; its debates regarding "lapsed" Christians, 209; character of its theological controversies, 405, 406.

Clemens, Flavius, executed by Domitian, 181.

Clement of Alexandria (Titus Flavius Clemens), his hymn, 83; on pagan religions and philosophies, 223; on the diffusion of Christianity, 30; his life and character, 342, 343, 354-356; his works analyzed and characterized, 343-360; his story of St. John and the robber, 344-346; his "Exhortation to the Greeks," 346-349; his "Instructor," or "Tutor," analyzed, with extracts, 349-360; on eating, 350; on laughter, 351; on the use of the tongue, 351; on clothes, 352; on fondness for jewels, etc., 352, 353; on frugality, 353; on philosophy and Gnosticism, 355, 356; on the relation of faith to knowledge, 355, 356; on the Incarnation, 356; on the sources of sin, 356, 357; on punishment and salvation, 357, 358; on asceticism, 358; on the salvation of all men, 359.

Clement of Rome, his writings, 101-121; Lightfoot on the traditions concerning him, 101; not, probably, the martyr-consul, Flavius Clemens, 103; his epistle to the church in Corinth characterized, and its contents described, 104-108; on St. Paul, 105; on the reorganization of the Early Church, 106; on the self-sacrifice of Christians, 107; his simplicity of mind, 107; his letter read as Scripture, 107; his second Epistle to the Corinthians analyzed, 108, 109; on the divinity of Christ, 108; on baptism and the resurrection, 109; "The Clementines" ascribed to him, 111.

"Clementines, The," their authorship, 111; contents of "The Recognitions," 111-116; extract from, 114; character of "The Homilies," 116, 117; anti-Pauline spirit of the work, 117, 118; Dr. Salmon on its doctrinal character, 118.

Clergy, the, when first distinguished from the laity, 72, 73.

Commodus, Roman Emperor, favorable to Christians, 197.

Constantine, becomes Roman Emperor, 214, 215; defeats Maxentius, 215; his "Edict of Milan," 215; writes to Alexander and Arius, urging a reconciliation, 403, 404; his second letter to Arius, 405; his motives for calling the Council of Nicæa, 408; his appearance before the Council, 412, 413; his treatment of petitions from ecclesiastics, 414; his address to the Council of Nicæa, 414, 415; sketch of his birth and career, 415-418; his conversion to Christianity, 417; his personal appearance, 418; approves the bishops' decision concerning "Homoousion," 431; banquets the bishops of the Council of Nicæa, 437; his farewell address and largesses to them, 437, 438; announces to the churches the Council's decisions, 438.

Council, the first Ecumenical, 393-443; for what purposes called, 396; Constantine's motives in calling it, 408; number and character of its members and their atten-

dants, 409, 410; discussions in the streets, 410; where held, 412; Constantine's appearance before it, 412, 413; his address to it, 414, 415; distinguished men in it, 415–428; its parties, 428; its treatment of an Arian creed, 429, 430; expels Arius, 429; agrees upon a creed, 431; creed adopted by it, 431; prohibits Arius from returning to Alexandria, and burns his book, "Thalia," 432; its decision on the Easter question, 433; its decree concerning the Meletian schism, 433, 434; promulgates twenty canons on discipline, 434–436; refuses to decree the celibacy of the clergy, 436; its close, 436; legend concerning the subscription to its decrees, 437; controversies that followed it, 439; Dr. Hedge on its importance, 440, 441.

Creed, the Nicæan, its adherents, 442; its vitality, 442; its essence, 442, 443.

Cyprian convenes a synod in Carthage, 21; his caution to the clergy, 72; on the equality of bishops, 74; a sacerdotalist, 77; on baptism, 88; on the baptism of infants, 91; on the Lord's Supper, 93; flees from persecution, 205; his martyrdom, 208.

Deacons, derivation and meaning of the word, 60, 61; origin of the diaconate, 61, 62; their two functions in Early Church, 62; Uhlhorn on their function, 63; Dean Stanley on the diaconate, 64; their duties in the Early Church, 64, 65; their number limited to seven, 65.

Decius, Roman Emperor, his persecution of Christians, 200–206; his edict against them, 201; apostasies of Christians in his reign, 202, 203.

Didache, or "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," 101; analyzed, 123–129; when the MSS. was discovered, 123; other books contained in the MSS., 123; importance of the document, 123; variously dated by scholars, 124; the oldest manual of apostolic teaching and discipline, 124; quoted, 125, 126, 128; simplicity of its theology, 126; on Sunday and church officers, 127, 129.

Diocletian, Roman Emperor, his persecution of Christians, 210–214; associates Galerius with him, 211; his edicts against Christian churches and scriptures, 212–213.

Dionysius, his life, doctrine, and writings, 385, 386; Westcott on ibid., 386.

Dogma, the development of Christian, 49.

Domitian, the Roman Emperor, and the relatives of Jesus, 182, 183.

Easter, when first celebrated as a festival, 80.

Ebionites, their religious views, 281–283.

Ecclesiastical Systems, attempts to trace them to time of Christ or the Apostles, 53.

Ecumenical Council, the first, at Nicæa, 79, 393–443.

Episcopacy, the causes of its development into a hierarchy, 74; Lightfoot on its growth during the first three centuries, 75; its development followed by sacerdotalism, 76.

"Epistle to Diognetus," its authorship, 225; extracts from, 225–227; its value, 227.

Eucharist, the, when and how observed, 91; Justin Martyr on it, 92, 93; Tertullian on it, 93; Cyprian on it, 94.
Eulogius, a heathen philosopher, vanquished by an aged confessor, 410–412.
Eusebius, of Cæsarea, confidant of the Emperor Constantine, 423; presents a creed to the Council of Nicæa, 429, 430; accepts the term "Homoousion" in the creed, 431; criticises Papias, 141.
Eusebius, of Nicomedia, agrees theologically with Arius, 402; the foe of Athanasius, 424, 430; on the application of the term "Homoousion" to Christ, 430; his letter to the Nicæan Council torn in pieces, 430; subscribes the Nicæan creed, after inserting an Iota into "Homoousion," 432.

Fisher, G. P., quoted, 87.

Galerius, Roman Emperor, persecutes the Christians, 212, 214; his dying edict, 215.
Gallienus, Roman Emperor, characterized, 209.
Gallus, Roman Emperor, persecutions under him, 206.
Gibbon, Edward, on the causes of the rise and growth of Christianity, 39–43; on the controversies in the Church, 405.
Gnosticism, 277–284; its origin, 278; eclectic, 279; its principles and characteristics, 279–281; its various forms, 279; its sects distinguished, 280; its ideas of Christ and redemption, 280, 281; sketches of its chief representatives, 284–326; its good and evil elements, 326, 327; unfairly criticised, 331, 332.
Gospel, contents of that preached by Christ's disciples, 46; its appeal to human reason and to the sensibility of the wretched, 46; how propagated, 47, 48; shaped by Jewish ideals, 163; obstacles to its spread, 164.
Gregory (Thaumaturgus), his life, writings, and character, 387–392; his panegyric on Origen quoted, 388–391.

Hadrian, Roman Emperor, his persecution of Christians, 186, 187.
Harnack, quoted, 101; on Irenæus, 331; on the Valentinian schools, 310, 311; on Marcion, 315.
Hatch, on the changes in the functions of the episcopate, 71.
Hedge, F. H., on the ancient Church controversies, 440, 441.
Helena, wife of Constantius, 416.
Heracles, bishop of Alexandria, 384, 385.
Heresies, — the Struggle within the Church, 276–332; use of the term by Fathers of the Church, 276; their treatment by the Early Church, 332.
Hermas, his book, "The Shepherd," analyzed and characterized, 129; Lightfoot on the book, 129; the Fathers' opinion of it, 130; Athanasius's opinion of it, 131; opinions as to its authorship, 131, 132; on divorce and second marriages, 137; on fasting, 137.
Herrick, his verses on fasting, 138.
"Homoousion," its religious history, 430; adopted by Constantine and the Nicæan Council, 431.

Hosius, bishop of Cordova, described, 423.
Hymnology of the Early Church, 82; Evening Hymn of the Greek Church, 82; the "Gloria in Excelsis," 82; a hymn by Clement of Alexandria, 83.

Ignatius, of Antioch, 141–152; authenticity of his letters, 141-143; his death, 143; legends about him, 144; a Greek, of Asia Minor, 144; thrown to wild beasts at Rome, 145; his letter on his coming martyrdom, 145, 146; his letters to the churches, 146–151; on the orders of the clergy, 148; his letter to the Magnesians, 148, 149; his letter to the Trallians, 148, 149; on his own inspiration, 149; on the Eucharist, 149; on Judaism, 150; on Docetism, 150; his silence concerning a bishop at Rome, 151; striking passages in his letters, 151; his letter to Polycarp, 151.
Immersion, baptism by it in Iceland and Russia, 58.
Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, 21; on the early Christian Church, 26; his life and works, 330; on Gnosticism, 330, 331.

James, bishop of Nisibis, 424. 425.
Jesus of Nazareth, his teaching, 14, 15; belief of his disciples, 15; gave a mighty impulse to human life, 16; his transcendant personality, 43–45.
John, the apostle, tradition concerning him, 180.
Judaism, its influence on the Romans, 38.
Justin Martyr, on regeneration by baptism, 87; his martyrdom in the reign of Aurelius, 192; incident related by him, 193; his origin and character, 227, 231; his search for truth, 228, 229; his account of his conversion to Christianity, 229–231; his writings, 232; analysis of his "Dialogue with Trypho," 232, 233; analysis of his first Apology, 233, 234; of the second, 235, 237; contrasts Socrates with Christ, 235; his doctrine of the "spermatic word," 236; his martyrdom, 237.

Lactantius, his "Apology" for Christianity, 253.
Lightfoot, bishop, on Clement of Rome, 103; on the Christian ideal, 56; on first appearance of episcopal government, 68; on the authenticity of Ignatius's letters, 142; on the persecutions of the church at Antioch, 143, 144; on authorship of the "Epistle to Diognetus," 225.
Love-Feasts, discontinued by the Roman Christians, 186.
Lucian, ridicules Christians in his "De Morte Peregrini," 222.

Magus, Simon, his doctrinal scheme, 284–286; characterized by Tulloch, 286.
Manes, sketch of his life, 320–322; his theological system (Manichæism) analyzed, 322–326; his opposition to the Old Testament, 324; spread of his doctrines, 326.
Marcion, the anti-Judaistic Gnostic, his history and doctrines, 314–319; attractiveness and spread of his doctrines, 315; his contrasts between the Old Testament and the New, 318; he and his followers fundamentally Christian, 321.

Martyr, Justin, his defence of the early Christians, 171, 172.
Maxentius, elected Roman Emperor, 214; defeated by Constantine, 215.
Maximin, Roman Emperor, persecutes the Christians, 200.
Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, his schism, 396, 397; his subsequent history, 434.
Menander, the Gnostic, 286.
Minucius Felix, his "Octavius," 252.
Miracles, sanity of the Christian apologists regarding them, 41; not urged by early Christians in support of Christianity, 41.
Mommsen, Theodor, on the immorality of Rome, 37.
Monarchians, their doctrines, 329.
Montanus, his doctrines, 254, 327, 328.

Neo-Platonism, its origin and representatives, 333.
Nerva, "the Good," stops persecution of Christians, 183.
Nicæa, in Bithynia, described, 406; Isnik, its modern representative, 407; Council called in it by Constantine, 408–443 (see "Council, First Ecumenical").
Nicholas, bishop of Myra, 425.

Ophites, their origin and religious system, 312–314.
Origen, visits churches in Arabia, 20; on the number of early Christians, 30, 31; his escape from martyrdom, 200; his life, labors, and character, 360–370; enters the Catechetical School of Alexandria, 360; becomes head of the School, 362; his self-denial and toil, 362; studies Hebrew and Greek literature, 363; assisted by Ambrosius to publish his works, 364, 365; Westcott on his writings, 365; consecrated as a presbyter, and deposed, 366; establishes a catechetical school at Cæsarea, 367; his "Exhortation to Martyrdom," 367; his devotion to his exegetical studies, 368; his last works, 368, 369; subjected to torture, 369; his death and burial, 369; his mental acuteness and power, 370; his prolific production, 370; his "Hexapla," 370, 371; his "First Principles," 371; his book against Celsus, 371, 372; quotation from ibid., 373–376; on allegorism in interpreting Scripture, 376; on the mystical sense of the Scriptures, 377; his theological system, 378–384; held to the freedom of the will, 381; on the story of the fall, in Genesis, 382; on salvation through the Word, 382, 383; on future punishment, 384; his influence to-day, 392.

Pantænus, his life and character, 340–342.
Paphnutius, bishop of Upper Thebes, 425; his speech on the celibacy of the clergy, 436.
Papias, his life and writings, 139–141; on the second Gospel, 140; on Matthew's Gospel, 140; Eusebius's disparagement of him, 141.
Paul, the apostle, his epistles, 14; his birth, education, and conversion, 17; shaped the theology of the Christian Church, 17; his conception of the Gospel, 18; his labors and martyrdom, 18; on the distinction of days, 84, 85; his powerful personality, 100; his idea of Christianity, 163, 164.

Paul, of Samosata, his view of Christ, 329.
Perpetua, her fortitude as a martyr, 199.
Persecutions of the Christians, 16, 143, 144, 156, 157, 163–217, continued till about A.D. 310; by the Jews, 165–167; caused by the superstitions of the populace, 170; by the Roman Emperors, 173–266; their number, 179; by Nero, 179, 180; by Domitian, 181; by Trajan, 183–186; by Hadrian, 186, 187; by Marcus Aurelius, 189–197; at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul, 194, 195; in Numidia and Carthage, 198, 199; by Septimius Severus, 197–199; by Maximin, 200; by Decius, 200–206; drive some Christians to apostasy, 202, 203; in Rome and Alexandria, 203; in Carthage, 204; their various forms, 205; they intensify the Christians' faith, 206; under Gallus and Valerian, 206–208; suspended for forty years, 209; promote the triumph of Christianity, 210; under Diocletian, 210–214.
Pfleiderer, on Ignatius's letters, 142, 143.
Philo-Judæus, his life and sentiments, 336.
Philo-Platonism, its influence on Christianity, 337–340.
Pierius, of Alexandria, 386, 387.
Pliny, Roman governor, his proceedings against Christians in Bithynia and Pontus, 184–186; his famous letter to Trajan, 184.
Polycarp, 152–162; sources of information about him, 152, 153; a hearer of St. John, 153; Irenæus on his acquaintance with him, 153, 154; entertains Ignatius, 154; his discussion with the bishop of Rome, 155; his rebuke of Marcion, 155; his character, 155, 156, 161; his last days and martyrdom, 156–160; his replies to the Roman proconsuls, 158, 159; his prayer at the stake, 159; his letter to the Philippians, 160, 161.
Potamiæna, her martyrdom, 198.
Predestination, its first appearance in Christian theology, 309.
Presbyters, origin of their appointment, and their duties, 65–67; advisers of the bishops, etc., 70; change in their functions, 71.
Ptolemaus, his martyrdom, 193.

Quarto-Deciman controversy, 80.

Ramsay, Dr., on Ignatius's letters, and his martyrdom, 143; on the anti-Roman organization of the early Christians, 177; on Roman laws against Christianity, 184; on a statement of German critics about Trajan, 185; on Marcus Aurelius, 191.
Ritschl, quoted, 76.
Roman Church, deference early paid to it, 73; causes of increase of its bishop's authority, 73; St. Peter not its founder, 74; no dictation by its bishop allowed in this period, nor ever in the Eastern Church, 74.
Romans, the, as conquerors and rulers, 33; extent of their public roads, 34, 35; their immorality, 37; their disgust with life, 38: their expectancy of a new message to men, 38.

Sabbath, kept by the early Christians, 84; its gradual disappearance, 85; abstinence from labor

on it advised about A.D. 200, but not made compulsory till A.D. 363, 85; Constantine's decree regarding it, 85.
Sacerdotalism, not recognized in the New Testament, nor by the Apostolic Fathers, 76; its claims first asserted by Tertullian, 76; supported by Cyprian, 77.
Sacramentalism, its first appearance, 86–89.
Saint Peter, when first claimed as founder of the Roman Church, 73, 74.
Saturninus, the Gnostic, his doctrine, 288, 289.
Seneca, on the wickedness of his age, 36.
Septuagint, its origin, 335; legendary account of it, 335.
"Seven good men," of the Early Church, not deacons, 63.
Severus, Septimius, Roman Emperor, persecutes the Christians, 197–200.
Sixtus, Roman bishop, his martyrdom, 207.
Smyrna, persecution of its Christians, 188.
Socrates, church historian, on the celebration of Easter, 80.
Spyridon, bishop of Cyprus, anecdotes of, 425, 426.
Stanley, Dean, on Nicæa, 407; on Paphnutius, 436.
Struggle within the Church, — Heresies, 276–332.
Sylvester, bishop of Rome, 427, 428.
Symphorosa, a Christian martyr, 187.
Synod of Egyptian and Lydian bishops that excommunicated Arius, 400; in Bithynia, upholds Arius, 403.
Synods, when first held, 77, 78; why called, 77; how composed, 77; promoted unity, 77; in Asia Minor, Gaul, Mesopotamia, Rome, Africa, and Spain, 78.

TACITUS, on the early Christians, 23, 24; quoted, 179, 180.
Tatian, Christian apologist, 237–246; his birth, education, etc., 237–239; becomes a gnostic, 239; his death, 239; his writings, 239; some of his Gnostic ideas, 239; his "Address to the Greeks" analyzed, 239–244; his ridicule of the Greeks, 240; also of their philosophers, 241, 243; his "Diatessaron" and its history, 244, 245; value of the latter work, 245, 246; denounced by Irenæus, 246.
Tertullian, 253–273. on the multiplication of Christians, 26–29; his "Address to Scapula," "Apology," "To the Nations," and "Answer to the Jews," 26–29; asserts sacerdotal claims, 76; on baptism, 88; opposes infant baptism, 91; on the Lord's Supper, 93; on the persecution of the Roman Christians, 170; his vindication of the early Christians, 173; on pagan religion and philosophy, 213; his life and character, 253–256; an advocate and jurist, 254; his character as a Christian apologist, 254; espouses Montanism, 255; his death, 255; character of his writings, 255–260; his Montanist writings, 255, 256; his mental and moral qualities, 256; his style, 257; extracts from his writings, 257–274; his denunciation of the circus, 257–259; on patience and penitence, 259; his apologies, 260–275; his "To the

Martyrs" analyzed, 260–262; his "Apology" analyzed and characterized, 262–273; on Marcus Aurelius, 264; on the Roman sumptuary laws, 264; on the power and methods of demons, 267; on the organization, worship, charity, and pure life of the Christians, 269–271; replies to charges against Christians, 271; on the pagan philosophers, 271, 272; on the resurrection of the body, 272; on the persecution of Christians, 272, 273; his book "Concerning the Testimony of the Soul," 273–275.

Theology, the Latin, 442.

Theophilus the Goth, teacher of Ulfilas, 427.

Trajan, his persecutions of the early Christians, 175, 184–186; his orders to Pliny regarding the Christians in Bithynia and Pontus, 184; did not initiate persecution of Christians, 185.

Trinitarian controversy, its origin, 394, 395.

Trinitarianism, when authoritatively formulated, 395.

UHLHORN, on the mutual love of the Early Christians, 48; on the Roman roads, 34; on the "Seven good men" of the Early Church, 63; quoted, 215.

VALENTINUS, the Gnostic, 302–311; his education and life, 302, 303; his theological system sketched, 304–311; Harnack, on his system, 310, 311.

Valerian, Roman Emperor, his persecution of the Christians, 206; his edicts against them, 207.

Victor, bishop of Rome, first claimant of universal dominion, 70; his excommunication of the Quarto-Deciman churches, 74.

Virginity, two early epistles on it, 109, 110.

WESTCOTT, on the writings of Origen, 365; on the writings of Dionysius, 386.

THE GREAT RELIGIOUS BOOKS OF THE DAY.

ECCE HOMO.
ECCE DEUS.

Although it is now some years since the publication of "Ecce Homo" and "Ecce Deus," the sale of these extraordinary and remarkable books continues quite as large as ever. Some of the ablest and most cultivated minds in the world have been devoted to a critical analysis of them.

The foremost man in England, the Right Honorable W. E. Gladstone, has just published a book devoted entirely to a review of "Ecce Homo," in which he uses the following language: —

"To me it appears that each page of the book breathes out, as it proceeds, what we may call an air, which grows musical by degrees, and which, becoming more distinct even as it swells, takes form, as in due time we find, in the articulate conclusion, 'Surely, this is the Son of God; surely, this is the King of Heaven.'"

Of "Ecce Deus," which may be considered the complement of "Ecce Homo," there are almost as many admirers, the sale of both books being nearly alike.

Both volumes bound uniformly. Sold separately. Price of each, $1.00.

PROF. INGRAHAM'S WORKS.

THE PRINCE OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID; or, Three Years in the Holy City.

THE PILLAR OF FIRE; or, Israel in Bondage.

THE THRONE OF DAVID; from the Consecration of the Shepherd of Bethlehem to the Rebellion of Prince Absalom.

The extraordinary interest evinced in these books, from the date of their publication to the present time, has in no wise abated. The demand for them is still as large as ever.

In three volumes, 12mo, cloth, gilt. Sold separately. Price of each, $1.50.

THE HEAVEN SERIES.

HEAVEN OUR HOME. We have no Saviour but Jesus, and no Home but Heaven.

MEET FOR HEAVEN. A State of Grace upon Earth the only Preparation for a State of Glory in Heaven.

LIFE IN HEAVEN. There Faith is changed into Sight, and Hope is passed into Blissful Fruition.

From Rev. Samuel L. Tuttle, Assistant Secretary of the American Bible Society.

"I wish that every Christian person could have the perusal of these writings. I can never be sufficiently thankful to him who wrote them for the service that he has rendered to me and all others. They have given *form and substance to everything revealed in the Scriptures respecting our heavenly home of love*, and they have done not a little to invest it with the most powerful attractions to my heart. Since I have enjoyed the privilege of following the thought of their author, I have felt that there was *a reality* in all these things which I have never felt before; and I find myself often thanking God for putting it into the heart of a poor worm of the dust to spread such glorious representations before our race, all of whom stand in need of such a rest."

In three volumes, 16mo. Sold separately. Price of each, $1.00.

Three volumes in one, 12mo. Price, $2.00.

Mailed, post-paid, to any address, on receipt of the price by the publishers.

Dream Life and Real Life.

A Little African Story.

By OLIVE SCHREINER,

AUTHOR OF "DREAMS" AND "THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM."

16mo. Half cloth. 60 cents.

These are veritable poems in prose that Olive Schreiner has brought together. With her the theme is ever the martyrdom, the self-sacrifice and the aspirations of woman; and no writer has expressed these qualities with deeper profundity of pathos or with keener insight into the motives that govern the elemental impulses of the human heart. To read the three little stories in this book is to touch close upon the mysteries of love and fate and to behold the workings of tragedies that are acted in the soul. *The Beacon.*

Three small gems are the only contents of this literary casket; and yet they reflect so clearly the blending of reality and ideality, and are so perfectly polished with artistic handling, that the reader is quite content with the three. It is a book to be read and enjoyed. — *Public Opinion.*

There is a peculiar charm about all of these stories that quite escapes the cursory reader. It is as evasive as the fragrance of the violet, and equally difficult to analyze. The philosophy is so subtle, the poetry so delicate, that the fascination grows upon one and defies description. With style that is well nigh classic in its simplicity Miss Schreiner excites our emotions and gently stimulates our imagination. — *The Budget.*

All the sketches reveal originality of treatment, but the first one is a characteristically pathetic reproduction of child-life under exceptional circumstances, that will bring tears to many eyes. — *Saturday Evening Gazette.*

Sold by all booksellers. Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of the price by the Publishers.

ROBERTS BROTHERS, BOSTON.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 022 208 118 A